

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 1909.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

William R. Harr to be Assistant Attorney-General.
CONSUL.

Gebhard Willrich to be consul at Quebec, Canada.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Milton F. Davis to be judge-advocate with the rank of major.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the navy:

Cleon W. Mauldin,
Chester L. Hand,
Aubrey K. Shoup, and
John J. McCracken.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the navy:

Cleon W. Mauldin,
Chester L. Hand,
Aubrey K. Shoup, and
John J. McCracken.

Passed Asst. Surg. Richard B. Williams to be a surgeon in the navy.

First Lieut. Albert N. Brunzell to be a captain in the Marine Corps.

Second Lieut. Paul A. Capron to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the navy:

Charles H. Hosung,
Adam Gibson,
Charles G. Nelson,
Fred J. Korte,
Clarence M. Wingate,
Jannis V. Jacobsen,
George W. Johnson, and
Francis J. McAllister.

Carpenter Charles E. Richardson to be a chief carpenter in the navy.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Charles W. White, at Julesburg, Colo.

ILLINOIS.

Jennie M. De Roo, at Fort Sheridan, Ill.
M. M. Hitchcock, at Berwyn, Ill.
James P. Jack, at Newton, Ill.
William W. Lowry, at Auburn, Ill.

IOWA.

Henry E. Westrope, at Corning, Iowa.

MAINE.

Fred W. Preble, at Bingham, Me.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Ralph W. Emerson, at Chelmsford, Mass.

NEW JERSEY.

Herbert C. Farrand, at Bloomfield, N. J.

NEW YORK.

Ivans Lewis Hubbard, at Bay Shore, N. Y.
Agnes M. Nolan, at Chateaugay, N. Y.

OKLAHOMA.

A. H. Holland, at Cushing, Okla.
William N. Walker, at Stillwater, Okla.

RHODE ISLAND.

William H. Barclay, at Pawtucket, R. I.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Lancey W. Dragoo, at Smithfield, W. Va.
William J. Crutcher, at Holden, W. Va.
Mary Hateley, at Follansbee, W. Va.
Frederick Moore, at Belington, W. Va.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 10, 1909.

The Senate met at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, with whom do live all the spirits of those who depart hence to labor with Thee, with tender heart we halt and hesitate to acknowledge the mystery of Thy providence. We know, alas, that in the midst of life we are in death. Open our eyes also, our Father, that we may know that in the midst of death we are in life.

For Thy servant whom Thou hast called to Thy higher labors we thank Thee, who art the giver of every good and perfect gift. Grant, we pray Thee, that his mantle of charity, of faith, and of love may in some measure fall upon all of us, that here and now in a measure we may walk like him with God. And unto Thee shall be ascribed all the glory, in life and death, now and forever more. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Wilmington, Del., praying for the creation of a department of public works for the purpose of considering all work in connection with creating, maintaining, and lighting of the navigable waters of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against any increase of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, as proposed in the so-called "Payne tariff bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oswego, N. Y., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on tea in bulk, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the retention of the duty on print paper and wood pulp as contained in the Dingley tariff law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying that no change be made in the rate of duty imposed by the House on print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the inclusion in the pending tariff bill of any duty on news print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the restoration of the duty on foreign oil production, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of members of the New York Times Chapel, of New York City; of members of the Quadri Color Company of New York City; of the employees of the Stereotype department of the New York World, of New York City; of the members of the Evening Telegram Chapel, of New York City; of the members of the American Press Association Stereotypers' Chapel, of New York City; of the members of Harper & Bros.' Chapel, of New York City; of the Stereotypers employed by the New York Volks-Zeitung, of New York City; and of the members of the German Herold Chapel, of New York City, remonstrating against the inclusion in the new tariff bill of any duty on news print paper and wood pulp; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry photo-engravers employed by the Quadri Color Company, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of the duty recommended on post cards in the new tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 30, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Berlin, N. H., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp as contained in the Dingley law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Wilmington, Del., praying for the creation of a department of public works, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

A bill (S. 2564) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Beckley, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 2535) granting an increase of pension to George M. Lanpher (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McENERY:

A bill (S. 2566) for the relief of Jean Marie Heriard;
A bill (S. 2567) for the relief of Edward Haskinson;
A bill (S. 2568) for the relief of Mrs. Martha B. King;
A bill (S. 2569) for the relief of W. G. Wheeler;
A bill (S. 2570) for the relief of Washington West;
A bill (S. 2571) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Smith;
A bill (S. 2572) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. E. J. Penny, deceased;

A bill (S. 2573) for the relief of heirs or estate of H. Pierce, deceased;

A bill (S. 2574) for the relief of heirs or estates of R. J. Packer and Mrs. R. V. Packer, deceased;

A bill (S. 2575) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. Mary A. Meredith, deceased;

A bill (S. 2576) for the relief of heirs or estate of Charles Jolivet, deceased;

A bill (S. 2577) for the relief of Turner Merritt;
A bill (S. 2578) for the relief of Louis P. Turner;

A bill (S. 2579) for the relief of heirs or estate of George W. Hackett, deceased;

A bill (S. 2580) for the relief of heirs or estate of Henry J. Heard, deceased;

A bill (S. 2581) for the relief of heirs or estate of Patrick McCormack, deceased;

A bill (S. 2582) for the relief of heirs or estate of George Sallinger, deceased;

A bill (S. 2583) for the relief of heirs or estate of Edward Sigur, deceased;

A bill (S. 2584) for the relief of heirs or estates of Henry Vedrines and Alexis Hebert, deceased;

A bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Julien Semere;
A bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Evelyn Clark;

A bill (S. 2587) for the relief of heirs or estate of William Burgess, deceased;

A bill (S. 2588) for the relief of heirs or estate of Isaac Bloom, deceased;

A bill (S. 2589) for the relief of James Goodwin;
A bill (S. 2590) for the relief of E. A. Givens;

A bill (S. 2591) for the relief of heirs of Thomas J. Hickman, deceased;

A bill (S. 2592) for the relief of heirs or estate of Jacob Israel, deceased;

A bill (S. 2593) for the relief of heirs or estate of Henrietta Bauers, deceased;

A bill (S. 2594) for the relief of heirs or estate of H. T. Burges, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2595) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Louis Vuagnat, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich	Bulkeley	Crawford	Dixon
Bacon	Burkett	Cullom	Dolliver
Beveridge	Burnham	Cummins	Fletcher
Borah	Burrows	Curtis	Flint
Brandegee	Burton	Davis	Foster
Briggs	Chamberlain	Depew	Frazier
Bristow	Clark, Wyo.	Dick	Frye
Brown	Clay	Dillingham	Gallinger

Gamble	Lodge	Page	Stephenson
Guggenheim	McCumber	Paynter	Stone
Heyburn	McLaurin	Penrose	Sutherland
Hughes	Martin	Perkins	Taliaferro
Johnson, S. Dak.	Money	Piles	Taylor
Johnson, Ala.	Nelson	Root	Warner
Jones	Newlands	Scott	Warren
Kean	Oliver	Simmons	Wetmore
La Follette	Overman	Smoot	

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is unavoidably absent to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PORT OF SCRANTON, MISS.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, according to the unanimous consent agreement we can do no legislative business except the census bill and the tariff bill, but I have a bill that will take about a minute to dispose of which it is absolutely essential should have immediate consideration. It will not take five minutes. It is Senate bill 2493, simply proposing to make the port of Scranton a port of entry. It has been so considered for many years. There are about 300 vessels clearing there every year, and now by a ruling of the Secretary of the Treasury, made the other day, upon application for a ruling from shippers abroad—in Philadelphia and Baltimore, I will say, to be specific—he has ruled that it is simply a port of delivery, and he requests that this bill be passed. It has been reported by the Committee on Commerce. The ruling works a great hardship, because vessels wishing to deliver at that port will have to sail 35 miles and pay double pilotage and it will cause loss of time and a general dislocation of business.

I hope the Senate will permit the bill to pass. There will be no debate about it whatever.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be read for information.

The bill (S. 2493) to make Scranton, in the State of Mississippi, a subport of entry, and for other purposes, was read, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that Scranton, in the State of Mississippi, is hereby made a subport of entry in the district of Pearl River, and the necessary customs officers may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be stationed at said subport with authority to enter and clear vessels, receive duties, fees, and other moneys, and perform such other service as, in his judgment, the interest of commerce may require, and said officers shall receive such compensation as he may allow.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The SECRETARY. On page 129, beginning in line 25, it is proposed to strike out paragraph 373, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 27½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 38½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and, in addition thereto, on all the foregoing, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to state briefly that this amendment is intended to modify the historic scheme of compensatory duties which have appeared in our wool and woollen schedule now for forty-two years, by making the compensatory assessment not upon the weight of the yarn, but upon the weight of the wool contents of the yarn.

Many of these yarns are made very cheap by the admixture of various forms of low-grade cotton and cotton wastes. I hold it to be unjust and unreasonable and resulting in excessive assessments of duty to make the compensatory rate applicable to the entire weight of the merchandise, when the real compensation should be based upon the contents of the merchandise, our competing product having been raised in price by reason of our duties upon wool.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. The Senator knows, of course, that, with one exception, in all our tariff laws in the past the tariff has applied

alike, whether an article was of wool or part wool. That is intended to prevent fraud and difficulty in collecting duties.

In my judgment, if they come in, being called "wool," they should pay as much tariff as if they were all wool. As I said, in something like twenty tariff laws that has always been thought necessary, except in one act, where it applied to an article whose chief value was of wool. In all the others it has applied where wool has been a component part, whether 1 per cent or 99 per cent. I do not care to see the bar raised to let in articles that may be 1 per cent or 10 per cent wool at such differentials as the amendment proposes. A lot of substitutes let in in that way should all come in at the value they would come in at if all wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is in error in supposing that these goods are sneaked in under the pretense of being wool. On the contrary, there is no concealment or uncertainty about the material of which they are made. When we come to the law referring to cloths the statute expressly in one paragraph covers goods in which the entire warp is made of cotton or other vegetable fiber.

Mr. WARREN. It states what it shall be—cotton warp and wool filling.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The statute covers only goods that are of that character, and describes them. So the Senator is in error in supposing that these goods are sneaked in containing vegetable fiber unknown to anybody for the purpose of destroying the efficiency of the wool tariff.

I simply desire to say that it is not only perfectly reasonable that this tariff should be assessed upon the wool, but when I come to the next amendment which I propose to offer I shall show that it is perfectly feasible in the present state of our administrative system.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the vote be taken by yeas and nays.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, one moment, please. It is difficult for us to understand the exact effect of this amendment. It has not been printed, and we have only heard it read. I understand, though, from the general tenor of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa that the effect of it will be to reduce the duty.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Substantially.

Mr. BACON. In this connection I desire to state, not only with reference to this amendment, but to others which will doubtless be offered by the Senator from Iowa, and possibly by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], that I do not wish to be misunderstood in giving my vote for them. In common with others on this side of the Chamber, who, I presume, agree with me, I shall vote for these amendments, not because they put the duties where I or my colleagues think they ought to be. I think they will still be too high. I shall vote for them simply because they reduce the duties.

There is another thing I wish to say. I do not myself approve of the plan of specific duties in this schedule, and in voting for the specific duties which are contained in this amendment, and will be contained in others which will be offered, I do not wish to be understood as approving specific duties. My vote is cast for them solely upon the ground that, according to my understanding of these amendments, they will reduce the rates of duty from those proposed in the bill. While they are not of the character which we prefer, and do not reduce the duties to the point which we regard as sufficiently low, we support them simply because they are an improvement, in our judgment, upon the provisions of the pending measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this amendment the Senator from Rhode Island demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is absent. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] and I vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. FRYE's name was called). The junior Senator from Maine is paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. The Senator from Virginia is detained at his house by illness. I will announce this pair for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. HALE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HALE] is detained at his home by illness. He is paired, I think, with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McLAURIN. I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Alabama

[Mr. BANKHEAD]. On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. BAILEY (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to inquire if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. BAILEY. I, then, desire to withdraw my vote, as I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I make that announcement for the day.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON], who is absent. If he were present, I should vote "yea." I will not make the announcement again to-day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON], and therefore I will withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Culberson	Hughes	Paynter
Beveridge	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner
Bristow	Davis	La Follette	Simmons
Brown	Dolliver	Martin	Smith, Md.
Burkett	Fletcher	Money	Stone
Chamberlain	Foster	Nelson	Tallaferro
Clapp	Frazier	Newlands	Taylor
Clay	Gore	Overman	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bradley	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandeggee	Depeew	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McEnery	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Page	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	du Pont	McLaurin	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Elkins	Nixon	Tillman
Carter	Frye	Owen	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	
Daniel	Jones	Shively	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 374, on cloths, knit fabrics, and all manufactures of every description, and so forth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute for paragraph 374.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 374, it is proposed to insert:

374. Cloths, knit fabrics, women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting and goods of similar character or description, and all manufactures made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued above 40 cents per pound, 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem; *Provided*, That all manufactures in part of wool not specially provided for in this schedule, when composed in chief value of a material other than wool, shall be subject to the rate at which the same would be chargeable under this section if composed wholly of the material thereof of chief value, and in addition thereto shall be subject to a duty of 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, a proposition very similar to that embodied in the amendment which I have just submitted was once debated in the Senate. It was offered, as the RECORD will disclose the debate in reference to it, upon the 4th of May, 1897. At that time it was occupying a single sentence. My former colleague, the venerable Senator Allison, having the bill in charge, said that there was no way in which such a provision could be administered. With that brief statement, and without intimating his opinion as to intrinsic merits of such a proposition, it was dismissed from the consideration of the Senate. I am glad to be able to state to the Senate that within the last twelve years we have found how to administer a provision like that. We have expended large sums of money in improving our methods at the appraisers' stores under our administrative customs law, and to-day it is perfectly feasible to sort with accuracy every fiber of wool contained in any kind

of cloth by weight. There is no difficulty of any sort at our analytical bureaus. In the case of a mixed fabric composed of cotton and woolen threads, a small sample of the cloth is unraveled, the cotton and woolen threads are weighed separately, and the percentage of weight of each material so found is accordingly applied to the entire cloth. Similar analyses are being made daily in order to properly classify, or find the "materials of chief value," in various mixed fabrics composed of wool, cotton, silk, and so forth. In cases where the wool and cotton are mixed in the yarns, samples of the goods are sent to the laboratory of the appraisers' office for chemical analyses, where, I am advised, the chemist finds no difficulty whatever in ascertaining the amounts of wool or cotton or other vegetable fiber contained therein.

In examining the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means, I find that Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, the textile expert of the Bureau of Manufactures, stated as follows (p. 5723):

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be possible at the custom-house (feasible or practicable) to ascertain the weight of the wool in those cotton-warp goods?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir; very easily. Take a piece of cloth that is made of cotton and worsted, say cotton warp and worsted weft; you would soak it in 5 per cent solution of sulphuric acid or oil of vitriol. As the water is driven off the acid attacks the cotton and leaves the wool. If you will look at it you will then see the cotton warp showing where the vegetable cellulose has been changed to a friable hydro-cellulose. Shake it and this drops to powder, leaving you only the ends of wool weft.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a comparatively simple process and can be done exactly?

Mr. CLARK. Exactly. Weigh the sample before and weigh what is left.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it practicable to fix a rate of duty per pound on the wool contained in those goods?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

In the RECORD of May 4, page 1718, it will be seen that Mr. S. S. Dale, a qualified expert in the woolen business, testified that "it is very easy to distinguish wool from vegetable materials, and if the proposed amendments to Schedule K were adopted, it would go far toward correcting the inequality resulting from the 3 or 4 to 1 ratios."

It is therefore apparent that the proposed method of assessing the wool compensatory duties upon the wool actually contained in mixed goods, made only "in part of wool," is feasible and practicable, and I firmly believe no good reason can possibly be advanced to maintain the present antiquated and manifestly unfair method of applying these high "compensatory wool rates" upon vegetable materials. Nor is this proposed plan of fixing the wool duty on "the wool contained" in the goods a new scheme, for the same idea is carried out in many of the provisions of our tariff; for example, the new Senate amendment on zinc provides various rates per pound, according to the "zinc contained in the ore."

Paragraph 171 provides a duty on antimony ore of "1 cent per pound on the antimony contents therein contained."

Paragraph 179 provides on "Lead-bearing ore of all kinds, 1½ cents per pound on the lead contained therein."

Similar provisions are found in many places in our tariff, and I hardly think that even the most biased of those who are interested in retaining the present cumbersome, confusing, and deceptive arrangement of duties on woolen-cotton mixed goods can fairly claim that the proposed method of simply applying the wool duty to the wool contents of imported merchandise would be as difficult for appraising officers as it is for them to properly classify and appraise various other lines of importations under the complex and confusing classifications of the tariff schedules. Take, for example, the variety of things an examiner or appraiser of silk goods must ascertain in order to properly classify and appraise such goods under the Senate bill's new silk schedule. He must find out whether the goods are "in the gum" or "ungummed," also "the per cent in weight of silk" and the "number of single threads per square inch," and "in ascertaining the number of single-warp threads to the inch, double-warp threads shall be counted as two single threads, and so on."

And in the case of cotton goods, as previously shown, the examiner of such goods must find the count of threads per square inch, counting not only the ordinary warp and filling threads, but under that very remarkable new provision in the Senate bill amendment to the cotton schedule, "if the cloth contains other than the ordinary warp and filling threads superimposed to form a figure, whether clipped or unclipped," such extra threads must also be counted, notwithstanding the courts have held it impracticable to so count them. The "weight per square yard" must also be determined in fixing the proper rate of the duty, and the bewildered examiner must

also send a sample of the goods to the analytical bureau to ascertain whether any thread or threads in the fabric have been mercerized "or subjected to a similar process;" then he must find the exact value, whether the market value, for instance, is 12 or 12½ cents per square yard, for this difference of one-half cent, or a difference of one quarter of a cent, over or below any of the proposed dividing lines makes quite a difference in the duty.

So it goes throughout these textile schedules, the examiners or appraising officers being obliged to ascertain this multitude of bewildering details in order to properly classify and appraise the goods; such as the "number of leas" in linen thread; the number of "points or spaces" in Nottingham lace curtains, pillow shams, and so forth; the number of "picks" and the "length of pile" in plushes and velvets.

In comparison with all these specifications and details in the various schedules of our tariff the amendments I have proposed are models of simplicity and fairness.

In order to facilitate the appraisement of woolen goods and articles containing an admixture of wool, and also to minimize any opportunity to defraud the Government of the proper duties under the proposed method of levying duties, I also propose a new provision making it obligatory on the part of the foreign exporter of such goods to specify in detail, in his consular invoice, the correct weight of the wool contained in each article embraced in said invoice, and that the weights so specified shall be binding in the ascertainment of duty upon importation into our country, except in cases where the appraising officers find such weights underestimated. And if the weights are not so stated on the invoices, the weights fixed by the appraising officers shall stand as the correct weights.

The proposed rates on woolen and worsted cloths would operate as follows:

	Cents.	
Valued at 30 cents per pound, containing 33 per cent wool:		
33 per cent of 33 cents.....	11	
50 per cent of 30 cents.....	15	
	26	= 87 per cent.
Present duties on similar cloth valued at 30 cents per pound:		
1 pound at 33 cents.....	33	
30 cents at 50 per cent.....	15	
	48	= 160 per cent.
Valued at 42 cents per pound, containing 45 per cent of wool:		
45 per cent of 44 cents.....	19.8	
42 cents at 50 per cent.....	21	
	40.8	= 95 per cent.
Present duty on similar cloth valued at 42 cents per pound:		
1 pound at 44 cents.....	44	
42 cents at 50 per cent.....	21	
	65	= 147 per cent.
Valued at 52 cents per pound, containing 55 per cent of wool:		
55 per cent of 44 cents.....	24	
52 cents at 50 per cent.....	26	
	50	= 96 per cent.
Present duty on similar cloth valued at 52 cents per pound:		
1 pound at 44 cents.....	44	
52 cents at 50 per cent.....	26	
	70	= 134 per cent.
Valued at 62 cents per pound, containing 65 per cent of wool:		
65 per cent of 44 cents.....	28.6	
62 cents at 50 per cent.....	31	
	59.6	= 96 per cent.
Present duty on similar cloth valued at 62 cents per pound:		
1 pound at 44 cents.....	44	
62 cents at 50 per cent.....	31	
	75	= 120 per cent.
Valued at 75 cents per pound, containing 80 per cent of wool:		
75 per cent of 44 cents.....	35.2	
75 cents at 50 per cent.....	37.5	
	72.7	= 96 per cent.
Present duty on similar cloth valued at 75 cents per pound:		
1 pound at 44 cents.....	44	
75 cents at 55 per cent.....	41.2	
	85.2	= 115 per cent.
Valued at \$1 per pound, containing all wool:		
1 pound at 44 cents.....	44	
\$1 at 50 per cent.....	50	
	94	= 94 per cent.

	Cents.
Present duty on similar cloth valued at \$1 per pound, all wool:	
1 pound at 44 cents	44
\$1 at 55 per cent	55
	99 = 99 per cent.

Mr. President, I have added to my amendment a little proviso intended to deliver the woolen schedule from the scandals and absurdities which have crept into it during the last forty-two years. I spoke not very long ago of a case where a cotton blanket, with a woolen fringe or cord about the end to prevent unraveling, had been classified as a woolen blanket and assessed at the full wool duty of 22 cents a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem because it was in part of wool. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] arose at the same time to say that such a thing was impossible and that such a blanket could not be made. Are they still of that opinion?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as a manufacturer of woolen goods, I will state that it is sometimes possible to put a cotton selvage upon a woolen cloth, but I never yet have seen in this country or in any other country or heard of any such thing as putting a woolen selvage upon a cotton cloth, because I can not conceive how it could be gigged. I can not conceive how it could be finished. The shrinkage in wool is different from that of cotton, and the gigging of it would simply cut the selvage entirely off.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator from Utah had listened carefully to what I said some weeks ago, and to what I have just said, he would not have introduced the word "selvage" into this controversy, because I spoke of a woolen fringe; and I have seen that term used in reference to an article of woolen manufacture in a decision of the appraisers' office in New York.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say that I have seen a great many blankets in my life, but I never saw a blanket fringed; and if fringe was ever put upon a blanket, it was put there for no other purpose on earth than to deceive. I have seen fringes upon shawls, but I have never seen fringe upon a blanket.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have, of course, seen a good many blankets, without giving very much attention to them; and I have read a good many Treasury decisions in the last few weeks, giving them the attention that they appeared to deserve. I read one of the reports called "General Appraiser's Decisions," on page 4313, wherein the blanket is described as a cotton blanket, the body of which is composed of cotton, the ends being whipped with colored threads of wool. So it seems that such a blanket can be made. I know of nothing to prevent the sewing of woolen fringe on any colored cotton blanket or other article, or any good reason why our tariff should be so framed that the wool duties must be applicable to all articles, no matter what they are composed of, if they happen to contain a small percentage of wool.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. The whipping of the ends of a blanket is not, certainly, a fringe. The Senator was unhappy in the use of the word, and I think, when he comes to think the matter over, he will certainly admit that the whipping of an end of a blanket is not a fringe.

Mr. DOLLIVER. When I find a thing attached to the edge of something I call it a fringe, and I do not intend to parley with my friend about the propriety of the language.

The Senator from Rhode Island resented my statement that rubber boots, if imported, would be classified as wearing apparel of wool if they were lined with wool. Does he still dispute the accuracy of that statement?

Mr. ALDRICH. I will not interrupt the Senator now. He can go on with the discussion.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And yet they would be so classified, and if anybody would be so foolish as to import them, knowing that that rate would be assessed upon them—for rubber boots are not especially provided for in the tariff—and if any part of wool they would be classified as wearing apparel in part of wool at 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem. I think I know that by a careful perusal of the Treasury decisions, because in Treasury decision 17511 slippers of vegetable fiber and part wool were held to be dutiable as wearing apparel in part wool at 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.

In another case shoes made out of rawhide, with a little comforting fringe of wool around the tops of them, were classified as woolen wearing apparel.

In one case corn plasters—and I should like the attention of everybody to this, because it seems to have reached the limit of absurdity—corn plasters, those little things that you put between your toes on the advice of a corn doctor, were held dutiable under the provisions covering wearing apparel in part of wool by Treasury decision 12665. Do you think a corn plaster ought to be classified under the tariff laws of a modern nation as wearing apparel? [Laughter.]

You have seen those good old mottoes that our mothers used to make with woolen yarn on cardboard, "Welcome"—and there never was a hospitality in this world more beautiful than that which lay behind those quaint old cardboards—and "God bless our home"—even those, when they come to the custom-house, if they should, by this Treasury decision are assessed up to 33 cents a pound and 50 per cent ad valorem, because they are cloth "in part of wool."

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he knows of an instance where those mottoes have been imported?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I reckon they have. I can tell you what happened to them, because I find in general appraisers' decision 5039 that exact decision made in reference to mottoes.

Mr. GALLINGER. There was probably but one such case.

Mr. DOLLIVER. In another case "mercerized cotton cloth; all cotton, except for some polka dots of goat hair which were glued upon the fabric, was held to be dutiable as cloth in part of wool at 44 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem" because of the goat-hair polka dots. The same cloth without these goat-hair dots would have paid but 40 per cent ad valorem under the cotton schedule.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think that if a poker game is indulged in with camel's hair the hair should come in free?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I hope the Senator will not introduce mysterious figures of speech with which I am not familiar. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I only thought the Senator was groping about for light on certain subjects.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now what did the appraisers say about this polka-dot proposition?

Mr. WARREN. They probably said they would raise the limit. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, let me tell you just what they did about it. They raised the limit from the duty provided in the cotton schedule, where the goods belonged, or rather, as a famous woman, once the wife of a foreign minister in this capital used to say, "Now, seeing that we are gentlemen, let us remove the limit." [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. How did the game go on?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am going to tell you. The polka dots lost out.

Mr. WARREN. As they ought to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; I will tell you what the Board of General Appraisers in this case said. They said:

The suggestion that the construction leads to the imposition of a duty which is exorbitant in amount and prohibitory in results is one that is more properly addressed to the Congress.

And that gave me the idea that I ought to present it here. Possibly I was mistaken. Maybe the appraisers did not know into what a state Congress had come; maybe they did not have it in their minds that Congress could get into such shape that everything is framed in solid framework in advance, not to be disturbed by any suggestion from any quarter. I am afraid there will be a good many heartburnings when this comedy is over. I do not want to be around near the seat of my honored friend from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] when his potatoes, with tears in their eyes, going out of the bill, meet the stockings of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] coming in. [Laughter.]

I believe the Board of Appraisers were right, and that the time has come to wipe out these absurd provisions of our tariff. When I suggested striking a similar provision for "in part" from the metal schedule the other day, I again incurred the displeasure of the Senator from Rhode Island, who stated that it had been in our tariff so long it ought to remain there, and that if it were not for that provision some wicked importer might succeed in bringing in fishhooks with feather flies as feathers, or sieves or something else in part of metal, at the rates they should come in under according to the material of which they were chiefly made. The truth is, these ancient "catch-all" provisions for "in part of" deserve to be denounced as the most vicious and unequal tariff provisions ever devised, and no matter what they were originally worked into our tariffs for, they should no longer remain. Their only purpose now is

to serve for excuses to classify any articles "in part of metal," or "in part of wool," and so forth, at rates of duty higher than the Congress intends to put upon them. In all cases where two or more rates are applicable the higher rate must be applied; and no matter how absurd or unreasonable the classification and rate so fixed, if a merchant succeeds in getting a fair ruling from the Board of General Appraisers, or the courts overruling these ridiculous classifications, there seem to be some who will still claim that the courts are in the wrong in making a sensible decision, and that the merchants are "committing frauds" upon the Government in thus trying to protect their rights. It seems to be for this reason that an attempt is to be made to create a new customs court of appeals, to take these cases from the federal courts.

And so, Mr. President, I have in the amendment asked the Senate to make this compensatory duty, which is intended to reimburse the domestic manufacturers for the extra price they are compelled to pay for their wool by reason of the wool tariff, assessable only on the wool in the goods. I want the assessment of these articles made, not on the weight of the article, which may contain many things beside wool, but upon the weight of the wool contained in the article; and then I add a proviso, applicable to the wool schedule, that when things come in they shall be assessed according to what they are, and if they have wool in them that the assessment shall be made on that wool upon the basis of the wool contents which they exhibit. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the vote on the amendment be taken by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Owing to my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], who is detained from the Senate Chamber, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). On the preceding vote, as well as on all the other votes of the day, I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ALDRICH (when Mr. WETMORE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WETMORE] is temporarily detained from the Chamber. He is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. My colleague, if present, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. I make this announcement for the rest of the day.

Mr. SCOTT. My colleague [Mr. ELKINS] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. I make this announcement now without having to repeat it during the day.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Culberson	Hughes	Rayner
Beveridge	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Bristow	Davis	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Brown	Dolliver	McLaurin	Stone
Burkett	Fletcher	Martin	Talliaferro
Chamberlain	Foster	Money	Taylor
Clapp	Frazier	Nelson	
Clay	Gore	Overman	

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Depeu	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	McEnery	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Flint	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Frye	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Guggenheim	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Paynter	Tillman
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	Wetmore
Elkins	Newlands	Shively	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph will be agreed to—

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the paragraph be agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer a substitute for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for paragraph 374 it is proposed to insert the following:

374. Woolen or worsted cloths, woolen or worsted shawls, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for this paragraph, because it has, among other things, the sacredness of age and the marks of authority. It was the paragraph prepared by the Senate Finance Committee in 1888, a short time prior to the enactment of the McKinley law, by the honored Senator from Rhode Island and my former colleague, the venerable Senator Allison. It was reported by the committee after exhaustive investigation. It was presented to the Senate in an admirable report which bears the name of the Senator from Rhode Island and commanded every Republican vote in this body. It is materially below the level of the rates now proposed, and yet not very much. I offer it in the vain hope that those who respect antiquity and are prone to follow authority will not find it in violation of their sense of duty to vote for an amendment which two years before the McKinley bill was enacted commanded the support of every Republican in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, this paragraph which has been presented, was, I think, a part of the bill of 1888, but it is an entirely different scheme. It is a different scheme as to wools and a different scheme as to woolens. It has no place here.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator is in error in supposing that the scheme is different in any way. It is the scheme of the McKinley bill, and the McKinley bill was the scheme of 1888, because the only thing that the Ways and Means Committee did was to take the great bill prepared by the Senator from Rhode Island and make a few immaterial amendments to it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa what is the proportion of reduction that he recognizes in the proposed amendment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator will read the bill, paragraph 374, he will see it says that where the value is not more than 40 cents per pound the duty shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on account of wools of the unwashed class.

This makes a specific assessment of 35 cents per pound, and it is a very substantial variation of that duty.

Mr. BACON. What is the conclusion the Senator reaches about that as to the proportion, approximately?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have a computation made here, which I will insert in the RECORD. I have already passed it up.

Mr. ALDRICH. I repeat that this was perhaps the provision in the bill of 1888. It was not the McKinley rates. When they were offered here and became the law they were entirely different from these and were upon a different scheme. The Senate act, to which the Senator refers, had a different scheme as to wools and woolens. This is taking out one part—a disjointed piece—which is entirely unlike the present law.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of it as an act. It was a bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was never enacted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It was a bill drawn with such care and such a wise regard to the American public that we fought that campaign upon it under General Harrison's leadership. This is not an isolated passage, and I will do that which lies within the reach of any man to see what difference there is between the scheme of the act of 1890 and the Senate amendment to the Mills bill in 1888.

Mr. ALDRICH. The act reported in the House by Mr. McKinley did not incorporate these provisions at all. It incorporated provision of an entirely different character, so that these suggestions, based upon lower rates on wool, were a part of the scheme never adopted by the Senate, except as a substitute for the Mills bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator from Rhode Island asks us to go back to the McKinley bill, and I differ with him only in

desiring to go back sixteen months further, and I took the testimony of Mr. Dale to show that the sixteen months did not make any difference in that industry which would make it improper to go back to authentic information. I have been accused on this floor of wanting in honoring the memory of a man who was once my colleague on this floor—

Mr. BACON. As the Senator from Iowa bases his contention for the support of this amendment upon the statement that it is the soundest Republican doctrine and that every Republican should vote for it, it is proper that I should say a word somewhat along the line of what I have already said to the Senate.

In voting for this amendment, I do not do so because I think that is the rate at which the duty should be assessed. I recognize it as a Republican rate, not a rate in accordance with Democratic views as to what the rates of tariff should be.

In other words, Mr. President, I shall support it because I regard it as a less evil than the provision in the present bill. I recognize that there are gradations of evil in the protective tariff as there are gradations of good in the revenue tariff. I do not recognize gradations of good in the protective-tariff system. In other words, I think it is bad and worse, and not better and good. Therefore, I shall, in the exercise of the discretion and judgment which I have as to which is the least oppressive to the people, vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa as the least of the two evils—not only as to this amendment, but I wish this statement to stand as to other amendments of which he has given notice. But, speaking of all of them, as an abstract proposition, I should be opposed to them, and I only vote for them because of their relation to the other; and I think it proper that I should state that before his schedule shall have been disposed of I propose to offer amendments, which I have already offered, which shall express the rate of duties which we think are proper rates of duty upon this schedule.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in the timely declaration of the Senator from Georgia, I think he might with entire propriety have gone a step further and assumed that he was speaking for his colleagues on this side.

Mr. BACON. I have had no opportunity to be put in a position where I could assume to do so. I had a few moments ago said I believed my position was shared by others on this side. I am glad to have the statement of the Senator from Missouri to that effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Again I announce my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I take occasion to transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] for the entire day. I will make no further announcement of it. I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FLINT (after having voted in the negative). I find that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner
Beveridge	Davis	La Follette	Simmons
Bristow	Dolliver	Martin	Smith, Md.
Brown	Fletcher	Money	Stone
Burkett	Foster	Nelson	Tallaferro
Chamberlain	Frazier	Newlands	Taylor
Clapp	Gore	Overman	
Clay	Hughes	Paynter	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandeggee	Curtis	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	McEnery	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Nixon	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bailey	Elkins	McLaurin	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Flint	Owen	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Culberson	Hale	Shively	
Daniel	Jones	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The paragraph was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 375, blankets, flannels, and so forth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer a substitute for the paragraph.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 375 it is proposed to insert the following:

375. Blankets and flannels for underwear, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 22 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. Blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duties as women's and children's dress goods.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who is absent. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NIXON (after having voted in the negative). I understand that I am paired with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Owen
Beveridge	Davis	La Follette	Paynter
Bristow	Dolliver	McLaurin	Rayner
Brown	Fletcher	Martin	Simmons
Burkett	Foster	Money	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Frazier	Nelson	Tallaferro
Clapp	Gore	Newlands	Taylor
Clay	Hughes	Overman	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandeggee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	McEnery	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	Elkins	Nixon	Tillman
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Shively	
Culberson	Hale	Smith, S. C.	
Daniel	Jones	Stone	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph is agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To what paragraph does the Chair refer?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Paragraph 375.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire, before the paragraph is agreed to, to offer an amendment as a substitute for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an open question.

Mr. CLAPP. I understand the Senator from Iowa has a number of these amendments. Are they in such a form that we might, perhaps, vote on them all with one roll call?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I find upon examination that they are not exactly in that form. There are only two or three more of them, and we will be through with them in a very few minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 375 and to insert a new paragraph 375, as follows:

375. Flannels, blankets, and hats, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; valued at above 30 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, upon all the

above-named articles, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire the Senate to understand distinctly that this amendment is the prevailing phraseology of paragraph 355 of the Allison-Aldrich bill of 1888. I desire to say further that the Senator from Rhode Island is in error when he says that there was any difference in the wool duties on the scheme and schedule of that bill as compared to the McKinley Act or the present proposed bill that would explain this variation in the duties on blankets and these cheap cloths.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa is mistaken in his last statement. The duty on wools of the third class by the act of 1888 was 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Exactly; but—

Mr. ALDRICH. Any Senator at all familiar with the classification of wools knows that third-class wools then, as now, enter largely into the manufacture of blankets—more largely than any other class of wools.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is true, possibly, of some kind of blankets, and especially horse blankets; but the duty on first and second class wool—

Mr. ALDRICH. On all blankets.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is exactly now as in 1888.

Mr. ALDRICH. On the first and second, but not on the third class.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The duty on all these wools, wastes, and by-products is exactly the same.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have the bill before me.

Mr. ALDRICH. So have I.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On top waste, roving waste, slubbing waste, garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound, just as that duty, although they did make a small concession in behalf of woolen rags, making them 10 cents, as I desired to do yesterday, but I encountered a storm of indignation from the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMOOT. The duty on woolen rags is 10 cents a pound now. What the Senator from Iowa wanted was 6 cents.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think I ought to have had it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator was not stating the facts as they were; that is all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, the act of 1888 received at the hands of the wisest and best men we had then not a few days' attention nor a few weeks, but attention month after month, day and night, as the Senator from Rhode Island will testify. What I ask now is that he permit me to make the same criticism of the bill that is pending here that he and Mr. Allison made of the Mills bill, that it put the heaviest duties upon the blankets and clothing of the humble people of the United States who were not able to bear them. That is demagoguery now, and a man almost gets out of his party for saying that now. Yet the criticism hurled by the Senator from Rhode Island on the Mills bill was that by making uniform rates of duty it bore with such hardship on the poor that the Senate had rendered the country a real service when they modified those rates.

But I do not care to debate it. I simply desire the yeas and nays on the proposition to go back to the Allison bill rather than to some subsequent or previous measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this amendment the Senator from Iowa demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator has not voted.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FLINT. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	Clay	La Follette	Rayner
Bankhead	Cummins	McLaurin	Simmons
Beveridge	Davis	Martin	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Dolliver	Nelson	Tallaferro
Brown	Frazier	Newlands	Taylor
Burkett	Gore	Overman	
Chamberlain	Hughes	Owen	
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandeggee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McEnery	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Flint	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	Elkins	Jones	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Fletcher	McCumber	Stone
Culberson	Foster	Money	Tillman
Daniel	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Dixon	Hale	Shively	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph is agreed to. The Secretary will read the next paragraph.

Mr. OWEN. Before the paragraph is agreed to, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is offering an amendment to paragraph 375?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will regard the paragraph as open.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought paragraph 375 had been adopted. It will have to be reconsidered if the Senator wants to move to amend it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will regard the question as open.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Oklahoma rose before the agreement was announced.

Mr. OWEN. I do not think it is absolutely essential for a Senator to rise in his place instantly in order to offer an amendment, and I do not agree to the rule of the Senate suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree if it had been agreed to it ought to be left open, and I think the Senator was before the time.

Mr. OWEN. I was simply answering the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that it might not be offered even if it had been agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to suggest that at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of paragraph 375 the following:

That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in this paragraph shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing ten fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the above enumerated articles, the President is authorized and directed to fix the rate on any such article or articles at the point at which such article or articles severally are found to have the greatest normal revenue-producing power, but not at a rate higher than the rate fixed in this act: *Provided further*, That the rate shall not be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States or abroad.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a yeas-and-nays vote on this proposed amendment. I shall be content with its being voted down by the majority, by the usual majority supporting the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is desirable to have a yeas-and-nays vote on the proposition. I would be very glad to have a yeas-and-nays vote.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection to a yeas-and-nays vote. Before that is taken, I shall therefore briefly explain its purport.

The theory of the majority, as expressed by the platform of 1904, is as follows:

The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The platform of 1908 asserts that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit—

And so forth.

Now, Mr. President, in the particular paragraph on blankets and flannel for underwear, paragraph 375, the rates run from 107.60 per cent on blankets valued at not more than 40 cents per pound up to 165 per cent on blankets more than 3 yards in length valued at more than 40 cents per pound.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the actual labor cost in blankets. The report of Carroll D. Wright, to which I have heretofore called attention, on the matter of blankets in case No. 390, puts the labor cost at 15 per cent of the value of the product, and yet this bill puts the tariff at over 100 per cent on the bald pretense of protecting American labor.

In case No. 391 of blankets the total cost of labor in transforming the materials is 15 per cent, and yet the pending bill puts this rate at exceeding 100 per cent on the pretense of protecting American labor.

In case No. 392 the total labor cost is 18 per cent, and yet this bill puts the rate at over 100 per cent on the pretense of protecting labor.

The Senator from Rhode Island, representing the Committee on Finance, on last Monday stated on the floor of the Senate that the labor cost was 80 to 90 per cent of all these products in the face of this official report in answer to a resolution of the Senate saying that the labor cost of these blankets is 15 per cent, and yet a rate of 165 per cent is put upon the blankets in order to give a monopoly to those who manufacture blankets in this country and enable them to levy a tax upon people who must use blankets for their protection against the inclemency of winter's weather.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. OWEN. With great pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Senator whether in his judgment the proposal presented by his amendment could not be made applicable to every paragraph in this bill; that is, vest in the President discretion to reduce duties below the rate fixed in the paragraph when in his judgment the revenue would not thereby be impaired and the best revenue-producing point could be reached?

Mr. OWEN. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, that could be done.

Mr. CARTER. Then, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if it would not be more simple to make the tariff bill consist of about three sentences, providing that the ad valorem rate on all articles presented to the custom houses for entrance into the United States should be fixed at, say, 200 per cent, provided that the President may reduce the rate below that amount when in his discretion the public revenues will thereby be benefited?

Mr. OWEN. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. CARTER. I have concluded. Why engage in these multifarious paragraphs and subdivisions if we could prescribe a maximum ad valorem duty for the admission of all articles at the custom-houses, leaving the discretion with the President to reduce the duties when in his opinion such reductions would not impair the revenue, but would reach the best revenue-producing point upon each article?

Mr. GALLINGER. A sliding scale.

Mr. CARTER. A sliding scale. In other words, we could not tell from day to day what the duty would be next week on any particular article unless we were advised of what the President's opinion might be at that future date.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I will answer the Senator from Montana first and yield to the Senator from Indiana second.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, I reply that legislative power can not be vested in the Executive.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me, Mr. President. I will answer the Senator from Montana first and yield to the Senator from Montana second.

Executive power is vested in the executive and legislative power is vested in the legislative branch of the Government. No one understands that more distinctly than the Senator from Oklahoma.

But it is not vesting in the President of the United States legislative power when he is directed by the legislative power to do a certain thing in a certain contingency. I will place in the RECORD the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on that point for the information of the Senate and, incidentally, for the information of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. OWEN. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. If a legislative power can be vested in the President, as this amendment proposes, why not a considerable amount of legislative power or all legislative power?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Montana by calling his attention to the fact that this very bill proposes to vest in the President the right to reduce a proposed additional 25 per cent tax upon all goods at his discretion, and if the objection to my proposed amendment of the Senator from Montana is well taken, it is equally well taken to the 25 per cent maximum and minimum amendment of the committee itself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. OWEN. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator make this distinction, that in the case of the maximum and minimum provision to which he is now calling attention, as in the case of the maximum and minimum provision in one section of the present law, the legislature fixes its will and the Executive becomes the instrument of the legislature in applying that will under certain contingencies, whereas in the amendment the Senator proposes the President is not directed to fix any specific rates, thus carrying out specifically the legislative will as its executive instrument, but is authorized to fix rates of his own? The Senator observes that distinction.

Mr. OWEN. I do not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then of course—

Mr. OWEN. There is a distinction without a difference, Mr. President. The spirit and purpose of both is substantially the same, that the legislative will is recorded and the Executive is required to carry it out. Every Executive must exercise some degree of discretion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the first thing I observe in the Senator's amendment is that from line 7 to the semicolon on line 11 it authorizes the President to perform all the legislative power which we might perform ourselves. Of course, the Senator can perceive that fixing the tariff rates at whatever we like is purely a legislative power. This authorizes and directs the President not to apply a definite and specific rate fixed by ourselves, but any rate that he sees fit to fix in his discretion. In other words, the executive mind is directed to perform the functions of the legislative mind.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I will yield with pleasure to the Senator from Montana when I have answered his colleague from Indiana. In this particular paragraph, item 1, blankets not more than 40 cents per pound, the legislative will is 107.6 per cent ad valorem. The legislative will under my proposed amendment next year would be 5 per cent less, which is as absolutely and mathematically an expression of the legislative will as it is possible to give. So, in each succeeding year the diminution is mathematically accurate, with a proviso, however, that when it goes below the maximum revenue-producing point it shall no longer be lowered, but the legislative will requires it to be definitely fixed at the maximum revenue-producing point found by means of this series of successive reductions. Therefore the Executive would be merely carrying out the legislative will and he would be an Executive and not a legislator. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] presents the facts upon a minimum rate with which the discretion of the President may operate; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] presents a maximum rate, and leaves the President with unrestrained discretion down to nothing or a complete abolition of duty altogether. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that, in the case of the reciprocity agreement, it will be remembered that a treaty was required in order to put the new rate into effect. The Constitution provides that treaties shall constitute the supreme law of the land; and I doubt very much whether, without consulting Congress or framing a treaty, it will be competent for the President of the United States, even under the minimum and maximum provisions, to change a rate of duty where the Constitution vests the supreme power in Congress in this matter of taxation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will now, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, ask him a question. How does he justify 165 per cent ad valorem when the cost of labor in the material is but 15 per cent?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I was one of the auditors of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last night, and heard him remark that the cost to the manufacturer of agricultural implements had increased, as far as steel products were concerned, over 100 per cent since the Dingley law went into operation. I could have assisted him somewhat on that in another illustration. The cost of wool has increased during the operation of the Dingley law 260 per cent, and measured by the price of wool to-day it has increased 275 per cent. The increase in the cost of the raw material was the difference between the conditions, doubtless, to which the Senator refers and conditions that have come to pass under the present law.

Mr. OWEN. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Montana intends to be humorous, but I should like him to make an answer to my question.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to know what the Senator from Oklahoma refers to specifically. I undoubtedly assume that the Senator has in his mind some peculiar phase of industrial life,

where a particular by-product, or some article, is produced at 15 cents, for instance, and that the duty, according to his method of calculation of the matter, amounts to what—60 per cent?

Mr. OWEN. To 160 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. To 160 per cent; or the duty, for instance, on wool at 11 cents.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator evidently did not hear my question.

Mr. CARTER. I wanted to say to the Senator that the duty on wool, as the price stood with us in 1897, is now in the neighborhood of 200 per cent, and yet it is a perfectly fair duty and the country has prospered under its operations. In the case doubtless in the mind of the Senator the application of a duty of 100 per cent instead of 60 per cent would, by its fruits, justify the levy.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Montana, in fixing the rates on the paragraph in question, not to be guided by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad at all?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the highest markets this country has ever been inflicted with, so far as the consumer is concerned, have been the markets when controlled by the foreign manufacturer and jobber. The Senator from Oklahoma well knows that when we shipped in iron rails here of English manufacture we paid \$130 a ton for them and more.

Mr. GALLINGER. We paid \$170 a ton at one time.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; at one time we paid \$170 a ton. We did not manufacture a single steel rail in this country. To-day, under this "oppressive tariff" to which the Senator refers, we are buying the best steel rails manufactured in the world for about 15 per cent of the cost of the old iron rails.

Mr. OWEN. And about \$8 a ton more than the manufacturers sell the same rails to foreigners, Mr. President.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. Our people pay about \$8 more than the foreigners pay for the same rails. The Senator from Montana, however, has not answered my question. I ask him whether or not he thinks the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad shall control in these matters, and I have illustrated it by pointing out that the labor cost on these woolen goods is only 15 to 20 per cent, and yet the tariff is put as high as 165 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, undoubtedly the purpose of legislation on the protective basis is to equalize the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the cost of labor in these blankets is from 15 to 20 per cent; and I ask him how he justifies putting upon them, over and above the total cost of American labor, an additional tariff of from 80 to 140 per cent ad valorem up to 100 to 165 per cent duty?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is calculating the hard-time wages of 1897 and 1898 as the basis of the American wages, and comparing them with the wages abroad of to-day.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on the contrary, I am agreeing, so far as this calculation is concerned, that the labor cost of the European product is absolutely nothing, and I call the attention of the Senator from Montana that the increase of wool price since 1898, the date of Commissioner of Labor Wright's report, up to 1907 has not been greater than the reported increase of labor, so his percentages are not affected by such changes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it was pretty nearly nothing in this country on the date the Senator's figures were made. In 1897 there were men in the country who could not get a day's work if they were willing to take a plate of soup as compensation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, that does not answer the question at all, because the labor wages of that time—in 1897—are clearly shown; and while it is true that in 1896 the market price of the whole world was at a low tide because of the preceding panic of 1893, it is not true that the cost of labor in percentages to value of product is now above what it then was.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in the production of a blanket the Senator wishes to make the comparison with the last man who touches the blanket in the factory. In order to estimate the cost of production it is necessary to go back to the sheep herder on the plains. That sheep herder in our competing country in South Africa receives \$3.66 a month, while out on the plains in this country he receives \$40 a month. Down in South Africa he receives a sack of corn and a sheep to board him for

a month, while out in our country he must have as good a bill of fare as they give in the ordinary hotel in Washington, or he will not stay by the job. These differences from the beginning must be computed and considered, in order to ascertain the elements of cost.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, they were considered as far as justified by common sense when the calculation was made by Carroll D. Wright. He puts the labor cost of producing yarn, for example, to which I call the Senator's attention, and which bears directly upon this matter—because I call his attention to the fact that even as to woolen yarn Carroll D. Wright, in Table 430, puts the cost of the labor of transforming materials at 2.6 cents per pound for No. 1 yarn and 45.22 per cent for the cost of material, less than 6 per cent of the cost of the finished product being for labor.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to ask the Senator from Montana one question, not to interrupt further than a question?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator from Montana think that, in order that the sheep herders of Montana shall be furnished with board on the scale of a Washington hotel, the price of wool should be raised to all the consumers of the United States, so that that purpose may be effected?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, if you eliminate the sheep herder of the country altogether and cut out the \$11,000,000 pounds of wool we contribute to the factories of the country, you will pay more for your wool than you are paying for it to-day.

Mr. BACON. But the Senator from Montana does not deem it wise to answer that question yes or no.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia proposes to settle a great, far-reaching economic question with the answer "yes" or "no." That, I think, is one of the elementary difficulties with the Senator's school of political economy in dealing with these questions. Each matter is taken in an isolated state, without any reference whatever to the surrounding conditions and circumstances; for instance, the standard of living, the standard of civilization, the education of the people, the manner of feeding and clothing them in this country, we think ought to be maintained. The maintenance of the standard, however, embraces certain costs in every avenue of life and endeavor which do not apply to the rice-eating millions of China; yet, if the Senator's theory should be carried into effect, the cotton of Georgia and South Carolina, instead of being manufactured in that country into merchantable shape, would be shipped to China, where the labor determines the element of cost to the best possible advantage of anywhere in the world.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Montana well knows the fact, Mr. President, that the labor employed in the production of cotton does not receive the hundredth part of a mill of benefit from the protective tariff.

Mr. CARTER. I refer to the cotton mills, Mr. President. It is not a new idea. As a matter of fact, the cotton of the Mississippi Valley has been for over ten years in process of shipment up along the Mississippi River to St. Paul; thence across the country to Seattle; thence across the ocean to Japan, where cotton fabrics are being manufactured by labor so low that it is appalling to contemplate the reduction of American workmen to the standard; and if you take down the barriers and consider these workmen separate and apart from the civilization and conditions under which we live, of course you would, as a pure matter of economy, leave the southern people to raise the cotton, dismantle the factories in the South and in New England, and ship the cotton to the Orient, where it can be manufactured cheapest.

Mr. BACON. Is that the Senator's answer to my question whether or not the sheep herder of Montana should be furnished Washington City hotel board at the expense of the people of the United States?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, that sheep herder is entitled to good treatment. He is a part of a mighty system; he is a part of the economy of the country. It is believed that, in order to maintain a supplemental food supply to put the country where it can raise its own clothing, and thus maintain a certain coveted measure of industrial independence, that even at the expense of paying our sheep herders more than the South African native gets, we ought still to keep them employed.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me—and I will not trespass further on his time—I want to say to the Senator from Montana that it is indeed a mighty

system which is so compact and so powerful that it can levy taxes upon 85,000,000 people in order to benefit less than 5,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, may I now ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether he would, in order to get wool cheaper, reduce the American sheep herder to \$3.66 a month in open competition with the South African native?

Mr. BACON. I would put the Montana sheep herder exactly where the Georgia cotton laborer is—making his living by the sweat of his brow, and receiving pay according to the value of his labor. I do not propose to ask that the people of Montana shall be taxed for the purpose of paying the wages of the Georgia cotton laborer, nor do I desire that the people of Georgia shall be taxed in order to pay the wages of the Montana sheep herder.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I hope the Montana sheep herder will never be compelled to work for the wages paid the Georgia cotton-field hand. I wish his wages could be better; but the cotton production is, I think, the greatest monopoly of all the crops in the world, and I am glad we have the monopoly in the United States.

Mr. BACON. "Monopoly," Mr. President, when it has to meet in the markets of the world the prices of the world! The Senator does not weigh his words.

Mr. CARTER. The area within which cotton—

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further to this interesting colloquy of the Senators from Montana and Georgia.

Mr. CARTER. The area within which cotton can be grown is so circumscribed on the globe that the monopoly is a natural one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Oklahoma allow me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. OWEN. With great pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am afraid this great proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma is getting obscured in this debate, and I am anxious—

Mr. OWEN. It will not remain so.

Mr. ALDRICH. And I am anxious to know whether the Senator from Georgia is engaging in this debate for the purpose of supporting the Senator from Oklahoma or for other reasons? We are not able to distinguish.

Mr. BACON. I did not hear the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was wondering whether the Senator from Georgia was opposing or supporting the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I was not paying attention particularly to the debate that was being maintained by the Senator from Oklahoma, but I did catch—

Mr. ALDRICH. I was a little afraid the Senator was ignorant—

Mr. BACON. But I did catch the most remarkable proposition which was made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], that the sheep herders of Montana were entitled to be paid wages which would enable them to get board equal to the board of any hotel in Washington City, and I knew that if that was done my people would have to pay part of the expense. That was what I was protesting against.

Mr. ALDRICH. I may not be a good judge of these propositions, but I think the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma is much more strange than the one suggested by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Oklahoma is quite capable of dealing with this question himself without my interposition, and I do not intend to interpose. I was simply struck by that remarkable proposition of the Senator from Montana. I am glad the Senator has made it, because it illustrates more perfectly than I have heard in this debate the iniquities of a protective-tariff system, by which in one State the laborer shall be paid wages which would give him board at the New Willard, and the people of the United States shall be compelled to pay a high price for wool in order that that end may be accomplished. That is the argument reduced to a nutshell; and it applies in greater or less degree to the proposition of the protective system as to other industries—to tax the people of the country at large to sustain private enterprises and increase their profits.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was anxious to ascertain whether this proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma was presented after

conference with his associates upon the other side of the Chamber, because it looks to me like an entirely new departure in tariff legislation, and it might revolutionize parties if it should be adopted. I am anxious to get a vote upon it as soon as possible.

Mr. OWEN. Before the vote is taken I will pursue the inquiry which I made of the Senator from Montana and which he so skillfully side-stepped that he got into the Chinese labor question and the sheep herders of South Africa before it ended. I now desire to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island, who is the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who knows all about cost, and who was kind enough last Monday night to advise me that the labor cost of materials was between 80 and 90 per cent, and kind enough to invite me to take the matter into prayerful consideration and go home and study it over and overcome my being new in the discussion of the tariff. He suggested that I was very new to the tariff debate, and therefore must be excused if somewhat irrational. I agree with him in his compassionate regard for a new Member, and hope that if anything I say seems to be unlearned or unsound, it may be considered as due to my inexperience in the discussion of the tariff.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me, Mr. President.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. OWEN. I would prefer not to yield now, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. RAYNER. All that I desired was this: I dislike to disagree with the Senator from Oklahoma, but his amendment strikes me as absolutely invalid. I think it goes directly—

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield for a speech by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senate has fallen into a practice, when a Senator is making an argument and trying to establish a proposition, of incursive discussion that leads the speaker far afield from that which he is attempting to establish. I should like to courteously suggest that, as a rule of propriety, this practice would be "more honored in the breach than the observance." I do not think it is courteous to Senators on the floor, when they are trying to establish a proposition, to introduce a side issue leading them far away from that which they are discussing. While I am always anxious to be perfectly considerate of every Senator while I am on the floor, and will always yield for any reasonable question, I do not think that the practice to which I have referred ought to be pursued in the Senate. I have often felt like entering protest against it, and I do so now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to his colleague?

Mr. OWEN. For a question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think it would be material if the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Wyoming would state what the price of wool was last September. The Senator from Montana has stated that it is 200 per cent more now than it was in 1897. I should like some one to state the price of wool in Wyoming and Montana last September.

Mr. CARTER rose.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I can not definitely state what the market price was last September, but my recollection is that the market price was about 18 to 20 cents per pound; it is about 24 cents now. The price in 1896 and 1897 ran down to about 6 or 8 cents per pound.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, just a word.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I happened to be in Wyoming last September, and was informed by people engaged in the growing of sheep and wool that the price was less than 14 cents. I do not think it was one-third of that in 1897, though in 1894 and 1895 it got down pretty low.

Mr. CARTER. There are certain clips of wool of inferior kind that always sell some cents below the regular market price.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, coming back to my question to the Senator from Rhode Island, he advised us that the labor cost of materials in the United States ran from 80 to 90

per cent. I call his attention to Carroll D. Wright's Table No. 430, on woolen yarns:

No. 430.—Woolen yarn: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound; No. 1 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0260	5.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.4522	94.56
Total cost.....	.4782	100.00

That does not correspond with the view of the Senator from Rhode Island as to 80 per cent being the labor cost, and I should like to have him explain it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma entirely misapprehended my statement. I will repeat it for him. I said the cost of every material and of every product is from 80 to 90 per cent labor, I care not what it is—I mean in the last analysis. In making that computation, you have to commence, of course, with the ore in the ground, with the elemental unit of production, whatever it may be. Everything beyond that is cost of labor. That is the proposition that I make; and I think the Senator will have great difficulty in arriving at any other conclusion if he investigates the subject carefully, as I am sure he will.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the answer of the Senator from Rhode Island that every product is substantially composed of labor is true in a broad sort of fashion. That everything used by man is the result of his labor is generally true, but it has no bearing upon and no relation to the question of the labor cost in yarns. According to this table, the labor cost in yarns is 5 per cent, and the Senator from Rhode Island stands here and demands 145 per cent tax upon yarn on the ground of its labor cost. Granted that 100 per cent of the cost of yarn was labor, granted that capital has no interest in it whatever, still that 45 per cent above 100 per cent is an excess even on the ridiculous theory of the Senator from Rhode Island. But it is not true, as a matter of fact, that yarn has over 5 to 10 per cent of labor cost as compared with the cost of the material and the other items entering into the cost of the gross value of the product.

Mr. ALDRICH. I heard the Senator a few moments ago make the statement that if the cost of the foreign product was nothing, then—

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me; the Senator did not apprehend what I said. I said if the labor cost were nothing.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, I understood the Senator to say if the cost of the foreign product was nothing.

Mr. OWEN. I said the labor cost.

Mr. ALDRICH. One proposition is just as good as another for my purposes.

Mr. OWEN. If one proposition is just as good as another for the Senator's purposes, he can state any proposition he pleases, but he must not make me responsible for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will wait patiently, I will give him a concrete illustration.

Mr. OWEN. I have great patience, and will wait.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the labor cost is nothing abroad and 10 cents in this country, what rate would have to be put upon the foreign value to equalize that condition? That is a mathematical problem which I should like to have the Senator work out.

Mr. OWEN. That is a mathematical problem which is very easily ascertained and worked out.

Mr. ALDRICH. What percentage would the Senator put upon the labor cost to equalize conditions?

Mr. OWEN. It is perfectly easy to determine the value of the labor cost in the United States; it is perfectly easy to determine the ad valorem which shall equal that cost.

Mr. ALDRICH. In case it cost nothing abroad, what would it be in the United States?

Mr. OWEN. That is a question broadly stated, applying to four or five thousand items, which the Senator well knows is impossible of mathematical answer, and therefore he asks somewhat triumphantly a question which no man can answer. It reminds me, I was going to say, of an ancient adage—

Mr. ALDRICH. I will give a concrete illustration. Suppose that an article cost nothing abroad and 10 cents here, what percentage of duty would the Senator put upon the foreign article to equalize conditions in the United States?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, take the question of yarn, for example. Supposing that the total labor cost in the United States

was 2.6 cents a pound, which is shown in Table 430 of Carroll D. Wright's report on labor cost; there is a cost of 2.6 cents a pound. If the value of the yarn was 26 cents, 10 per cent ad valorem would precisely equal that cost. There is a specific answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, mathematically.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator make that statement over again? My attention was diverted for a moment. I shall be glad to hear what he said.

Mr. OWEN. I will restate it with great pleasure. Carroll D. Wright's table, No. 430, shows that the total labor cost in a pound of No. 1 yarn is 2.6 cents a pound. If the wool entering our ports was valued at 26 cents per pound, 10 per cent ad valorem would meet the labor cost in the United States, granting that the labor cost in England was nothing; and 10 per cent is somewhat lower than 145 per cent, fixed in this bill as the tariff rate by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator does not understand my question or else certainly what he says now is not an answer to it. I will repeat what I said the other day. If the Senator had been familiar with tariff discussions, he would have been aware of the fact that this question of labor cost has always been injected and occupied a great deal of space in such discussions.

I want to say to him now that the labor cost at any single stage in this long process of manufacture has nothing whatever to do with duties, and can not be made to have. For example, take a jackknife. Jackknives are made abroad largely by farming out the different operations to people engaged in one particular process. For instance, one party might be grinding the blade, and it might cost a cent on that jackknife in one country and half a cent in another. That has nothing to do with the duties on jackknives. We are not dealing with a single part of or one process in this long series of operations any more than we are in yarns. It costs to pack yarns into boxes, for instance, a fraction of 1 per cent. Are you going to regulate the duty upon the cost of packing? Certainly not. It costs something to run the wool through the different processes, from one to another. Are you going to take one of those and talk about the labor cost involved?

The whole scheme is ridiculous. It does not get anywhere practically. What we want to compare is the total cost of production in one country and the other and equalize conditions on the total cost of production; and that total cost of production, in the last analysis, as I have stated, and I will repeat it, is based upon the cost of labor. If labor costs 50 per cent more in this country than it does in another country, or double what it costs in another country, that relative cost of production in the two countries is governed entirely by the scale of wages all through the production and all through every part of the life of the Nation. If you pay in Washington \$3 a day for a policeman and they pay \$1 in London, that difference of \$2, or \$1, or whatever it is, appears in additional taxes. It appears in the scale of living. It appears in the ultimate cost of production for every article; and the Senator will get back, I think, in the end to the proposition which I made the other day, that the ultimate cost of production of every article is 90 per cent labor; and if we live on a higher scale here, paying higher wages, we certainly, in the comparative cost of production, have to take all the wage scales of the United States into consideration. That is my answer to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. I have a certain intellectual sympathy with the Senator from Rhode Island in his effort to defend the indefensible.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no intellectual effort involved in it at all. It is just simply a plain statement of facts. I do not think it requires any intellectual effort either to make the statement or to understand it.

Mr. OWEN. The cost of production involves primarily as its chief factor, upon which the most part of all the debate has turned and the main discussion has occurred, the cost of labor and difference in the cost of production. I therefore, in the attempt to bring this matter to a clear comprehension of the relative cost of production, take the primary factor of the relative cost of labor, which can be presented plainly. The Senator from Rhode Island naturally and ingeniously obscures the issue by going into broad generalities and talking about the question of labor generally and the difficulty of determining the factors in manufacturing the thousands of involved items which enter into the general schedules, and he thereby skillfully obscures the issue, so as to make it incomprehensible to the ordinary investigator. But when I call his attention to the fact that Carroll D. Wright's table shows that in woolen yarn No. 1 the percentage of labor cost is almost a trifle less than 6 per cent of the value of the product, he explains it by a generality and

waves it lightly aside and imputes to me a lack of understanding as explaining why I ask the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will try this illustration. I will try to make an application of the rule I have stated to the very thing he has under consideration. He says it costs 2 cents a pound—labor cost—in making yarn. The cost of yarns in this country depends largely upon the cost of wool in yarns, and if wool costs 22 cents in Montana, and 11 cents for the same character in Australia, the American manufacturer pays 11 cents a pound more for his wool from which that yarn is made, to start with, and the same differences between the ultimate foreign and the domestic cost of production runs through every item. So you may be perfectly certain that you must, in your ultimate cost of production, consider the conditions of labor in both countries, both being in competition. The scale of wages in both countries determines the difference in the cost of production.

Mr. OWEN. The difference in the cost of wages in this country is conceded to be 2.6 cents a pound for No. 1 wool, and nothing more.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, not for No. 1 wool.

Mr. OWEN. No. 1 yarn. That is the Wright table, No. 430.

Mr. ALDRICH. He is talking about transforming materials from one stage to another and nothing else.

Mr. OWEN. Granting every possible concession that the Senator from Rhode Island can insist upon within the bounds of reason, when the labor cost of transforming wool into No. 1 wool yarn is between 5 and 6 per cent, there is no possibility by which a rate of 145 per cent can be justified.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is reading, I believe, from a document issued in 1898 or thereabouts.

Mr. OWEN. Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight to ninety-nine.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will turn to this document, just printed, which was quoted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last evening with such approbation, prepared by W. A. Graham Clark, special agent of the Department of Commerce and Labor, he will find, on page 5, that Mr. Clark says:

In general it may be said that the cost of manufacture of worsteds in England is about half that in the United States.

The Senator says it is 5 or 6 per cent. But here is Mr. Clark's statement that it costs twice as much in this country as in England.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is making a comparison of the cost in England and in the United States of worsted goods, where they obtain their wool at about half the price of what obtains here. I am talking about the labor cost in No. 1 wool yarn, as given in the Wright table, which has not yet been set aside as unsound. I am not talking about the cost of yarns or of wool in Montana and Australia, as the Senator from Rhode Island well knows, and I am not talking about the cost of manufactures of worsteds as the Senator from New Hampshire. They ingeniously and with intellectual cleverness confuse the issue of 145 per cent tariff on yarn being excessive.

Mr. GALLINGER. We pay more for our wool.

Mr. OWEN. I agree that the difference in the price of wool must be provided for in determining the difference in the cost of production, but when I call your attention to the labor cost in No. 1 yarn and when I call your attention to it as one of the important parts of the cost of production, in order that we may determine the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, I can not help but call the attention of the country to the vital fact that the Committee on Finance has furnished us with no record whatever of the labor cost of these articles nor of the cost of production, and has left it impossible for anybody to determine the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It can not be done with the data given to the Senate for that purpose, and I hold the party in power and the Finance Committee directly responsible for this fatal and deliberate omission.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have tried, with considerable patience, to explain this matter for the reason that these claims as to the labor cost of production appear and reappear in tariff discussions; and I want to state the fact that the labor cost of production at a single stage in a long process of manufacturing has no value whatever in determining either the relative cost of production or the proper rate of duty which must be assessed to equalize the cost of production. If the Senator, with his analytical mind, will follow the advice which I gave him the other

day, and will read that in the RECORD to-morrow, he must agree with me as to the accuracy of the statement I have made.

Mr. OWEN. I did read the matter in the RECORD. I examined it with critical care, and I find it utterly unfounded and utterly worthless. I mean to be respectful about it. But I am giving the honest judgment of my mind upon that statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand that the Senator bases this scheme of his upon a misconstruction of the statement which I made?

Mr. OWEN. Is the Senator alluding to the excellent amendment which I have offered?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I was alluding to that, and I hope to test the Senate at an early hour as to their views and judgment upon the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I base that amendment upon the theory of the Senator from Rhode Island and upon the Republican pledges of a tariff based on cost of production, and upon the Democratic view of a tariff for revenue, and not upon any conclusions of my own. Assuming the correctness of the declarations made by the Senator from Rhode Island that he is guided by the difference in the cost of production, my amendment could not possibly do harm. It might serve a useful purpose in bringing into effect the pledges made by the Republican party in 1904 and 1908, that the tariff should be written in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, always assuming that the tariff ought not to go below a revenue-producing point, which is the Democratic view, because that is essential to the maintenance of our Government.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does not the Senator see, while he is discussing in one breath the differences in the cost of production, that he is discussing mainly the difference in the labor cost at a single stage of the process?

Mr. OWEN. I have discussed the labor cost from these tables, taking the elementary cost of labor in wool yarns, taking the labor cost with the yarn as the crudest form of manufactured material in the woolen schedule, and I call the attention of the Senator, first, that there is only 5 and 6 per cent of cost of labor in the yarn, and then in blankets the labor cost is only 15 and 20 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator must be willing to admit, I think, that there is nothing whatever about the labor cost in the Chicago platform, and he is discussing a rule which no party has ever laid down, which no political economist has ever laid down, and which no party that had any idea or knowledge of tariff legislation has ever laid down. He is discussing something entirely immaterial and entirely outside of any of the questions to which I have alluded.

Mr. OWEN. I have sought in vain to obtain from some member of the Finance Committee, somewhere, the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The Senate of the United States has not been furnished with that information. The Senate will not be furnished with it. The inquiry is regarded as unreasonable and unsound, not in accordance with party promises, not in accordance with the desire of the people of the United States.

I desire to emphasize this because I believe the people of the United States do not feel willing to give greater advantages to our manufacturing classes than will put them upon an equality and a parity with manufacturers abroad; that it is not the intention of the American people to allow monopoly to be sheltered under this tariff; that it ought not to be done, and therefore I call attention to the Republican party pledges, and I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Finance has given us no data to show the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and when it is repeatedly called for and when it is emphasized we have mere glittering generalities, subtle evasions, and the vague mal apropos that everything which is made consists altogether of labor, that there is nothing in it but labor, and therefore we must deal with these questions as altogether the product of labor, and that nothing enters into it except labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will again turn to this recent publication of Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, he will find that, treating of an all-wool sateen, of botany wool, on page 88, he concludes his observations by saying:

This shows the American cost of manufacture per yard to be 127 per cent higher than the English.

And he gives a concrete sample, and yet the Senator says it is 5 or 6 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. I call attention, in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, to the fact that again he side steps and dis-

cusses "all-wool sateen" and does not consider the point I make—that the estimated cost in Belgium of woolen yarn is 3 cents a pound, which is higher than the American cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am quoting from a recent publication, which has been quoted with great approbation on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. OWEN. I have not seen the recent publication. But "sateen" has nothing to do with my point on the labor cost of No. 1 yarn, which has more labor cost in Belgium than in the United States.

Mr. CARTER. To begin with, it is perfectly safe to say that the difference in labor cost in producing the wool out of which the cotton yarn is made exceeds 100 per cent in this country, as against the markets in which Germany and England draw their wool supply. How that 100 per cent of excess is reduced to 5½ or 6 per cent in the computation of the Senator is a mystery, unless it be true that, according to the suggestion made by the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Oklahoma, in his computation, disregards the various elements that enter into the matter of cost and selects only one of the many incidents of labor from the beginning to the close of the finished yarn.

Mr. OWEN. I call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that I have shown the exact number of cents that the material in these articles costs, as well as the exact number of cents of labor cost.

Mr. CARTER. In producing yarn, it is first necessary to raise wool. Following the raising of the wool, it is necessary to shear it from the sheep.

Mr. OWEN. That is a very remarkable circumstance, and I am much struck with it.

Mr. CARTER. They sometimes pull it off. Then this item of shearing, for instance, costs from a cent and a half per head up to 4 and in some instances 5 cents in Australia. In the United States the cost of shearing is from 10 to 14 cents per head. Then comes the matter of scouring, and after the wool is scoured it has to go through the process into roving; then into another form; finally into yarn.

The Senator proposes to take the mere cost of transforming the rovings into yarn and say that that is the total difference in the cost of producing the yarn in the United States and the cost abroad, when he starts out with more than 100 per cent difference in the cost of producing the wool to start with.

Mr. OWEN. As far as this particular item is concerned, I simply call attention to the labor cost in making No. 1 yarn from wool, whether the wool be cut off or pulled out of the sheep by bodily force.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Utah in the midst of my explanation.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator base his argument upon No. 1 yarn as numbered or as to the quality of the wool?

Mr. OWEN. I base my argument on No. 1 yarn, from table 430 of Carroll D. Wright's report, and the yarn described therein.

Mr. SMOOT. It would make a great deal of difference whether it is No. 1 quality or a No. 1 yarn; and I want to tell the Senator right now that there is no No. 1 yarn as numbered used anywhere in the manufacture of goods. A No. 1 yarn means that there is a pound of wool drawn out 640 yards, and there is no such number as that used in the manufacture of goods. No. 8 is about the first we use, and those are used only in blankets. Every number increases in fineness and it costs that much more to make the yarn. So if the figures which the Senator is reading here mean No. 1 yarn, then of course they are useless, and if they mean No. 1 grade of wool, I want to ask what number of yarn Mr. Wright is figuring on.

Mr. OWEN. Carroll D. Wright gives the precise cost of the materials and other items entering into the manufacture of No. 1 yarn, in Table 430, and he gives the cost of labor in transforming the materials; the cost of the materials and all other items except labor are 45.22 cents per pound. The cost of labor to transform the material is 2.6 cents per pound. In Table 431 he gives the cost likewise of No. 2 yarn; in Table 433, No. 3 yarn, and so on down to No. 10 yarn. The use to which No. 1 yarn is put is utterly immaterial and irrelevant to the discussion, as the Senator from Utah must know.

Mr. SMOOT. I see from the statement there what the Senator is driving at, and I want to call his attention to the fact that he is talking about No. 1 yarn—a great, coarse thread, almost coarser than is used in any kind of goods in this country.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad the Senator has discovered that there is a No. 1 yarn. He denied its existence but a few moments ago.

Mr. SMOOT. I say again it is not used in this country. I know what No. 1 yarn means. No. 1 yarn means that a pound of wool is drawn out 640 yards, and the Senator must know, if he knows anything of the wool business or the manufacturing of it, that that would be a very, very coarse wool thread indeed, almost a roving, and it is not used in the manufacture of goods. As I have said, the finest wool yarn that is used in the coarsest kinds of blankets is about an 8, and it runs from that up to 60. Take the difference between the manufacture of an 8 yarn and a No. 60 yarn. The whole argument of the Senator, based upon No. 1 yarn, is wrong in theory. It does not work in practice and it does not fit any goods manufactured in this country.

Mr. OWEN. The labor cost of producing blankets is 15 to 20 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Allow me to tell the Senator that no doubt on the cheapest-grade blanket that is made, the very cheapest, it would be 15 per cent, but I can tell the Senator that I have made blankets by the hundreds of thousands where the labor cost of making a blanket was 40 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. That may account for things which have happened in the Senator's woolen business.

Mr. SMOOT. It will happen to anybody who knows anything about the manufacture of goods.

Mr. OWEN. It is very interesting to know at least from some authority what the labor cost is in the making of blankets. So it is 40 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. On some grades it is.

Mr. OWEN. Forty per cent under the highest-priced condition of labor that Utah affords, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. It is about the same as in other sections of the country, I think.

Mr. OWEN. The labor cost increases as you go west, in all lines. Everybody knows that to be true, and I suppose the Senator has overlooked the fact that it is true.

Mr. SMOOT. No, I have not overlooked it; I know what all the mills are paying in this country, and I know what we pay. The labor cost in the mills in Utah is about the same as in the East. Perhaps there may be some little difference on the lowest grade of labor, as an advantage to Utah, but the great bulk of labor is about the same there as in the East.

Mr. OWEN. I will ask the Senator from Utah whether he agrees with the Senator from Rhode Island that the labor cost is between 80 and 90 per cent, notwithstanding his experience of 40 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to discuss a question which was discussed when I was not here, and without knowing upon what basis it was made, but I judge from what the Senator says here that if he did make the statement that there was 80 per cent labor cost, it was the amount of labor from the raw product to the finished product, or in other words, to take a concrete case, from iron ore to the needle, and then I will agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it is 80 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. If that were true, then I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this tariff would be cumulative and would be several thousand per cent before you get to the finished product.

Mr. SMOOT. It is bound to be, from the very fact in the case I cited. Take the ore, which is worth only \$2.50 a ton. It must be more than a thousand per cent between the ore and the manufacture of the finest needles.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad to hear the Senator improve upon the estimate of 80 or 90 per cent of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator, Does he not believe it is?

Mr. OWEN. When you take the ore out of the ground and treat it, step by step, its increased value is due to human labor; but that proposition has no point in the proposition under discussion. It is a general truth that all things made are the products of labor.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. OWEN. That has nothing to do with the case where a manufacturer can bring in the material here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me. I must be allowed to answer.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. When these yarns have to be brought in here as a product, finished up to a certain point, and then converted into a blanket, the labor cost in handling that yarn must be considered as a new proposition, beginning with the yarn in question; and that percentage of labor in making a blanket is what Carroll D. Wright's report says is 15 to 20 per cent. Our

blanket manufacturers can bring in the product for use in weaving blankets and use it as raw material for the purpose of making blankets; and then the question is, How much of labor cost is involved in making the blankets with that material purchased and ready for blanket making in their hands?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's argument places him even in a worse position than he was before, because for the coarsest kind of blanket you can take the wool, after being scoured and placed upon the cards, and get it at 15 per cent of the labor cost—not the yarn, the Senator says—ready to put into the loom. I do not think it would be 15 per cent from the yarn itself manufactured to simply weave it into a blanket. Certainly the Senator has made his case worse than ever.

Mr. OWEN. It is perfectly patent to anyone who considers this matter at all that the manufacturer who is protected in blankets by 165 per cent, and who gets his material, the yarn ready to go into the blanket, is only entitled to the protection covering the difference in the cost of labor.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator evidently does not understand the processes of manufacturing woolen goods. If I could only take him into a woolen mill and show him the steps, I know the Senator could see it. It is a pretty hard thing, it seems to me, to show him by words in a way that the Senator can understand.

Mr. OWEN. I understand perfectly well the question of the cost of production involving the material and the labor. I have been through woolen mills and seen every step. I have been discussing the labor cost alone. The question of the material is provided for by the tariff duty upon wool and the various forms of wool. But in addition to that there is also the further tax provided for blankets and for every variety of woolen manufacture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to say that one hundred and odd more percentage outside of the duty is upon the wool and the manufacture of yarn?

Mr. OWEN. I do not. I am calling attention to the elements which enter into this manufacture, and I have called attention to it because I think that these schedules ought to be written in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. That is not being done, and I submitted the proposed amendment merely to call the attention of the Senate to this matter. Having done so, I now withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma withdraws the amendment. Paragraph 375 is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 376, page 131, line 26, after the words "ad valorem," the committee proposes to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That on all the foregoing, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the proviso carries these goods—it makes no difference what they are made of—if they weigh more than 4 ounces to the yard, back into the paragraph assessing duties upon woolen cloth, where they will encounter 44 cents a pound, owing to the compensation of the manufacturer and the cloth duty ad valorem. The House omitted it in view of the fact that these goods confessedly are not made of wool. I do not think that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. The provision was dropped out by mistake. It is in the present law and certainly it ought to be restored. It is the Dingley law and should be voted in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Before the paragraph is agreed to, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 376 it is proposed to insert:

376. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description, of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as is imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I offer that amendment because it appears to me to be a more rational classification of these various kinds of cloths, which are not woolen cloths at

all. They are described in the paragraph as cloths that are composed wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, so far as the warp is concerned. The remainder of the fabric may be composed in whole or in part of wool. So in these cloths there is no pretense made that they are woolen cloths except that they may have the weft of wool, though it is not necessary even for them to have all the weft of wool. I am told by expert weavers that when the warp is entirely cotton it is technically impossible to have the weft entirely of wool.

Mr. President, in 1897 Governor Dingley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had by his side a very wise counselor, especially upon the woolen schedule, and I hold in my hand the letter of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, dated January 26, 1897, in his own handwriting, introducing Colonel Tichenor, confidential adviser of the committee, to two gentlemen—the president and the secretary of the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association. I also hold in my hand Colonel Tichenor's letter to Governor Dingley, found among his papers, dated Washington, D. C., June 26, 1897, in which he calls attention to the fact that various changes have been made by the Senate committee in its bill on wools of classes 1 and 2, and reciting what he regarded as proper paragraphs covering yarns, cloths, blankets, and women's dress goods.

I have had such confidence in his knowledge in the mechanism of this tariff schedule, and I have had so many evidences of his dissatisfaction with the excesses and extravagances that have crept into the assessments of these rates, that I have taken the liberty to cut out of this yellow manuscript containing his notes upon the tariff law of 1897 this one, being in the form of a letter to Governor Dingley—paragraph 376 as Colonel Tichenor thought it ought to have been written in the Dingley tariff law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator put that letter in the Record?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have it not at hand here. I have a great mass of papers that I have not brought forward so as to avoid controversies of one sort and another which I do not desire to have arise at this stage of our proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. PILES], and I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Clay	Hughes	Overman
Bankhead	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Owen
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	Paynter
Bristow	Davis	McLaurin	Rayner
Brown	Dolliver	Martin	Taliaferro
Burkett	Fletcher	Money	Taylor
Chamberlain	Foster	Nelson	
Clapp	Gore	Newlands	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandeggee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Gamble	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	Elkins	Piles	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Frazier	Richardson	Stone
Bourne	Frye	Shively	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Simmons	Warren
Daniel	McEnery	Smith, Md.	Wetmore

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph is agreed to as amended. The next paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read paragraph 377, as follows:

377. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 11 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer a substitute for paragraph 377.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 377, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph 377, as follows:

377. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar character or description, composed wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, 12 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraph be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Paragraph 377 will be agreed to. The amendment of the committee in the next paragraph will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 378, page 132, line 15, the committee proposes to strike out the words "wool hats" and insert the word "including," so as to make the paragraph read:

378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on one pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer a substitute for the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 378 it is proposed to insert:

378. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph as amended is agreed to. The next paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

379. Webbing, gorings, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing India rubber or not, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer a substitute for paragraph 379.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 379 it is proposed to insert:

379. Webbing, gorings, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing India rubber or not, 50 cents per pound on the wool contained therein and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the duties upon any article held to be dutiable under Schedule K of this section shall exceed 100 per cent ad valorem, duty shall be assessed thereon at 100 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to say a word about the proviso. The main part of the amendment is the pending paragraph, except that it provides for the compensatory assessment of a specific duty on the basis of the wool contents of the article rather than upon the weight of the article itself. I have already discussed that question somewhat at length, and I will not say anything more about it except that if the duty is assessed upon the wool contents of the article it will be very materially less than if it is assessed at random upon the weight of the article without regard to the wool that is in it. But the proviso coming in at the end of these paragraphs, which undertakes to assess duties upon articles manufactured of wool, is intended for a very distinct purpose, and it is by this statute to make it hereafter unlawful to assess any duties, specific or ad valorem or compound, upon any of these articles which in the aggregate raise the duty above 100 per cent ad valorem. I

have every reason to believe that the maximum limit of the duty will not only adequately but amply protect every woolen manufacturing interest in the United States, and I have an idea that the Senate could do nothing more calculated to popularize the wool tariff than to take it out of the mouths of its enemies to say that we have so framed it that in any case the duty can rise in the neighborhood of 200 per cent. I say, make a maximum duty 100 per cent—no legitimate American manufacturing interest can suffer—and we have at least taken a step in the direction of refuting the evil reputation that has for so many years clustered about this schedule.

I am anxious also to have it done for another reason, I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island. I believe that it is the duty of the Senate and of its committees and of the joint committee upon conference to take some careful, well-considered steps to revise the woolen schedule. This amendment brings into question practically every paragraph in it and puts within the jurisdiction of the committee of conference all the questions which it would be necessary for them to examine in giving the Congress and the country the benefit of a final, careful, conscientious, patriotic review of this schedule, with a view to its revision according to the platform of our party and according to the just expectations of the American people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to hear the amendment read again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will again be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa contains two changes from the paragraph in existing law and as reported from the Finance Committee. First, it proposes to assess the duties upon the wool contained in these articles, which is an entire revolution and destruction of the wool tariff duties. If we are going to assess the duties upon wool contained in these different articles, we might as well abolish the wool schedule entirely.

The second proposition of the Senator from Iowa is that no duty shall be assessed at over 100 per cent ad valorem. This amendment has been always offered whenever the wool schedule has been before Congress for consideration. Our friends upon the other side have always placed great reliance upon a proposition of this kind.

The duties upon wool sometimes in the nature of things amount to much more than 100 per cent ad valorem. That is inevitable. As I stated the other night, in suggestions upon another subject, with a specific duty on first-class wool of 11 cents, and going up gradually for washed and scoured wools, many times the duty levied for the protection of the American woolgrower is more than 100 per cent ad valorem, and in cases like that, of course, it is necessary that there should be a compensatory duty which is greater than that which is imposed upon the wool. There are very few cases of this kind in any event, but if we should undertake to adopt this proposed paragraph as it stands woolen goods would be imported into the United States instead of wool.

We have had experience of that kind several times in our history. In 1883 and in 1894, by an improper adjustment between the wools and woolens, all the wools were imported into the United States in the form of wool goods, and the woolgrowers of the country were relegated to a condition which I will not undertake to describe, but which the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] described this morning in very eloquent terms.

No; this amendment is only another disguise for breaking down the wool and woolen paragraphs by the use of terms which look well upon their face, but which are in effect destructive of the wool tariff.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Iowa has repeatedly stated to the Senate that it is possible to measure this duty by the amount of wool that is contained in the article. Do I understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that that is not a fact?

Mr. ALDRICH. I say, practically, that it is not a fact.

Mr. CLAPP. Why practically?

Mr. ALDRICH. Because you can not undertake in a completed fabric to so dissect it as to find out just what amount of wool is in it. In the first place, you can not tell what the character of the wool is, whether wool of the first class, second class, or third class. There is no chemical process which can tell the difference between the fibers in the various classes of

wool. It will be impossible beyond that to tell the precise character. How are you going to find out about it? We would have to have in every custom-house in the United States a chemical laboratory, and not only a chemical laboratory in the ordinary sense, but a chemical laboratory to take into consideration not every invoice of woolen goods, but every piece of woolen goods which comes into the United States, because one piece might contain 90 per cent, the next piece might contain 78 per cent, and the next piece might contain 60 per cent of wool.

I remember perfectly well the proposition which was made in the Senate in 1897 which the Senator from Iowa has alluded to. I was not here when the thing was done, but I remember that we discussed in the committee scores of times that very proposition. There was not a man then in the Senate, I mean sitting on this side of the Chamber and anxious to have protective duties levied on wool and woollens, who did not agree that it was absolutely impossible to undertake by a chemical examination of the various cloths what was the actual amount of wool contained in them.

This wool and woolen schedule is very elaborate. The Senator says we ought to take it up in conference. It is a very elaborate schedule. It has been considered for years. It has been agreed to on all hands. The Senator from Iowa must be as certain as I am that the conference committee between the two Houses is not going to take up this question with a view to its adjustment according to new lines. That would be impossible, unless we propose to stay here for six months.

I am quite willing that the body to whom we propose to refer these matters in the amendment to the maximum and minimum provisions shall take up the question of the conditions between these competing countries or of these industries. I should be very glad to have those people take up this question of whether any legislation on the wool and woolen duties is necessary; but I am absolutely as certain as that I stand here that, whenever a readjustment is made, if it ever is made, it can not be made upon the suggestion that as to goods imported into the United States the rate is going to be fixed by reference to the amount of wool contained in any of those articles. In the case of goods brought into the United States, articles of wearing apparel for instance, how is a customs officer to take a cloak or a dress or any of those things and cut out a piece for examination by chemical analysis in order to show the actual percentage of wool? Then, how is anybody going to know whether that wool is of one class or another, whether it shall pay the duty of 7 cents a pound or 12 cents a pound? The whole scheme is as impracticable as it is possible for any proposition to be.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island combines two propositions in one. I assume that the customs officers have got to know what the class of woolen goods may be under this bill as it is now framed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that twelve years ago this was not a practicable proposition, but that in the advance in this matter to-day, it has become practicable. I have sat here, Mr. President, for a couple of days and have listened to the arguments made by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] yesterday, and I must say that it seems to me that they have not been answered. It does seem to me that some recognition should be made of the arguments and illustrations offered in criticism of this schedule. I have asked a question, and it does not yet seem to me that the Senator from Rhode Island has given a sufficient answer why a duty should not be collected on the wool itself.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the Senator wants the evidence of anyone, I can bring him thousands of people who are engaged practically in the manufacture of these goods, and they will all tell him just what I tell him and just what the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is a practical manufacturer, has told him, that it is utterly impracticable. You might as well discard the whole wool tariff if you are going to change the basis of it in this way.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I have heard several propositions here. I heard the proposition on mercerized cotton, a proposition that placed the duty some several hundred times above the possible addition to one grade of mercerized cotton. I sat in this Chamber and heard the answer made that there was no remedy for that. I do believe that there is a remedy for these inequalities, but I am not going to take the time of the Senate now to discuss them.

The Senator from Rhode Island says that 100 per cent is not high enough; that that would force the importation of the goods, instead of the wool, into the country.

Mr. ALDRICH. I say it might.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Rhode Island says it might. I want to ask him if the illustration he made that those woolen goods came in over a tariff wall of 100 per cent—

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, what is proposed here is to place the limit at 100 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I will give the Senator a concrete case—

Mr. ALDRICH. Just one word, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. President, this question of adjustment between wool and woollens has been before Congress as an active, live question since 1867 on the present basis. The best men who were ever in this body, or in any other, have considered this question very carefully, and have considered every aspect of it from top to bottom. The present law is based upon the act which Mr. McKinley introduced in the House of Representatives, and which became a law in 1890. The present law was framed and reported to the House of Representatives by Governor Dingley; and I think there was no man who has ever had a seat in either House of Congress who pursued his investigations upon questions of this kind with more intelligence and more conscientious care for the interests of the Government and the interests of the people of the United States than did Governor Dingley. Mr. Allison, who sat in this Chamber, gave months and months to the consideration of this case. Has there been any newly discovered wisdom and virtue in regard to this matter; have there been any new experts brought here or suggested in reference to this matter, that the judgment of these men should be overthrown upon the mere say so of anybody? I think not.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Undoubtedly the 100 per cent proposed as the total duty on the imported cloth is necessary as a protection to the woolgrower of this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is true.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But, Mr. President, the duties now collected in a specific form, reduced to their equivalent ad valorem, are less than 60 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it is a question merely of valuation which classifies. I think it will appear as a fact capable of demonstration that the average cost to our competitors of producing wool is more than 11 cents per pound, and at anything less than 16 cents a pound the American wool-grower must go out of business. Even at 16 cents per pound he can not continue his investment unless totally disregarding profits upon it and depreciation as well.

Mr. WARREN. Right along the line of the remarks made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who has just taken his seat, I have a few facts here which may throw some light upon the subject; but before I go into figures, I want to say that this matter has been tried both ways in tariff laws. In 1816 the tariff was placed upon manufactures in which wool was "the article of chief value," but in the other tariff laws the duty has always been put upon the fabric of which "wool was a component part," it mattered not whether it was 1 per cent, 50 per cent, or 100 per cent. That was done, in my judgment, for two reasons—not only to protect the grower of wool, but also to protect the consumers and laborers of this country. For instance, if an article came in here that had 5 per cent of wool and 95 per cent of substitutes, possibly substitutes upon which there was no duty, it came in practically free; it would be just that much manufactured in another country coming in against the manufacturers and laborers of this country and taking away just that much labor. So that it is maintained that what is put in here is not entirely a compensation for the wool which is in it, but is largely to protect the workmen and the workingwomen in this country. We have had some trial of that heretofore.

I now go back to the official figures for 1880. That was before the change of the tariff of 1883, which was made against, as it seems it proved to be against, the interest of the manufacturers. As they were in dull business, or out of business, it reacted upon the woolgrowers and affected them also. These two industries suffered alike. I will give the official figures.

In 1880 we imported of raw wool—good, pure stock that could be made up into clothing—128,131,747 pounds. During that same period we imported only \$33,911,093 worth of woolen goods. It only amounted to that much of the woolen manufactures. All of the balance for our consumption was manufactured at home. That period of success in both lines went on until the legislation of 1883, which went into effect in 1884. Of course I am skipping that date because we have not the census

figures; but we took the census again in 1890. It will be understood that while ten years passed, three of them would have been in favor of my contention of increased use of raw wool and decreased use of manufactured woolen cloth in our imports, as against seven the other way. So it is fair to presume that whatever benefits or losses occurred would be the result of about three or four years' gain and six or seven years' loss, one deducted from the other.

Now, we will proceed to sheep. On January 1, 1884, we had 50,626,626 sheep. That was the time when the 1883 tariff went into effect. On January 1, 1894—and I take that period because it was before the disastrous effect of the Wilson law, and therefore any losses occurring in that period must have been, if on account of any tariff regulation, on account of that tariff of 1883, which went into effect in 1884—from 50,626,626 sheep we went down to 45,048,017, showing a decrease in sheep of more than five and a half million head.

As I said before, that is really the destruction of seven years of bad times, caused by bad legislation, less three years of good, which makes a very great loss, even if you apply it to the whole ten years; but a still greater loss if applied to the portion left after the subtraction, giving an equivalent of four years net.

I will say that in 1880, just before this, we had in this country 2,330 woolen manufacturing establishments, all doing a fairly prosperous business. The value of their product was \$238,085,686.

Now, we will note the result. We used, in round numbers, \$33,000,000 worth of imported woolen manufactures and over 128,000,000 pounds of imported raw wool at that time. In 1890, ten years thereafter, the 2,330 woolen manufactories had decreased to 1,693 factories, and the total product of our home manufacture of wool, with all the growth of the country, which should have given us a very large increase, amounted to only \$270,527,511, and showed an increase of about 1½ per cent per year, which is infinitesimal when you compare it with the growth of the population for that time. In the meantime, instead of \$33,000,000 worth of imported woolens, we imported over fifty-six and a half million dollars' worth.

When it comes to the importations of wool, which, with the great increase in the manufacture of woolen cloth and the increase in population, ought to have shown a very great result, they had shrunk to 105,431,285 pounds. That shows the effect of permitting manufactures of woolen goods to come in here to the detriment of both the woolgrower and the manufacturer, but more especially to the detriment of the laboring class of people who would find employment in the manufacture of these goods.

The goods might have but one thread of wool, or they might be all cotton; but, at the same time, if we can manufacture the goods here, the whole labor engaged in the manufacture is done by our own citizens and, therefore, adds that much to the wealth of the country.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. BACON. The Senator speaks about the number of sheep and their diminution along about 1894 and 1895. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the figures for 1903 and 1905. It appears that in 1903 we had 63,964,876 sheep, and that two years thereafter we had only 45,170,423, a decrease of more than 18,000,000. How does the Senator account for that? That was almost ten years after the Wilson bill was passed.

Mr. WARREN. I am very glad the Senator asked that question. The first figures that he read, if he will notice, are not from the census, or mid-census, that occurs every five years between the decennial censuses, but are made up, without any regard to the figures of the census, upon estimates sent in. Such figures merely represent their opinions, while I am quoting from the official figures of the census of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that which is generally known, and I think he will at once take note of it. The European wool market became thoroughly demoralized in 1902. The lowest price was reached for wool in the European market in 1903 that had ever been reached in the history of the wool market.

The result of that demoralization was the introduction into our markets, notwithstanding our duties, of an excess of Euro-

pean wool for sale at any price, and it was sold in many instances at a very great loss. The Senator will recall the market disturbances that occurred in England beginning with and growing out of the Boer war, the great demand for money, the inability to hold stocks that had accumulated, and the consequent throwing upon the market of the wool that had accumulated. That wool found its way into the American market with the duty paid. If it had not been for our duty at that time there would have been the most ruinous prices in this country ever encountered in the history of the trade.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, I want to say that my object in calling attention to it was to illustrate the fact that our friends on the other side of the Chamber, when they are in the wrong, can always find some other reasons for it than those which are to be attributed to the tariff, if it happened to occur during the existence of a protective tariff. They find some reasons other than the tariff for the panic of 1907, although they do not think there could have been any other reason for the panic of 1893 and 1894.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator asked me a question, and I hope he will permit me to answer.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was not responsible for the Senator not having an opportunity to answer.

Mr. WARREN. I have carefully examined the figures as to sheep, and I want to say that if the Senator will look upon a certain page of the report of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association he will find the total given as 38,000,000 at the time the official statistics here give the number at about 54,000,000. Those figures vary greatly; but when you come to examine the matter, you find that the association has taken into consideration only the grown sheep that were sheared and has excluded all the others.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me right there; he does not think any of those inaccuracies occurred when the census was taken in regard to the number of sheep along about 1894? I suppose the figures are always absolutely accurate then.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me to finish, there is another thing in connection with a census of sheep. There is a time when a lamb becomes a sheep, or a calf becomes old enough to count; but those dates have been shifted in the counting of sheep. On the 25th day of December you may ask any farmer how many sheep he has and he will give you the number of grown sheep; but if you ask him after he has separated his flocks, taken his inventory, and arranged his bands for winter, then the lambs have become more than half a year old, and so in counting he puts them into the regular list of sheep.

The Senator will find recorded the differences that I mentioned. There have been times of difference, but when we accept these regular census figures of the United States, taken every decade, we do so with the assurance that they have been taken the same way every time and can be depended upon for each ten-year period.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I do not dispute that at all; but I simply want to call attention to the fact that here is a fluctuation, according to these figures, of 18,000,000 sheep, and when that is called to the attention of Senators on the other side, these reasons are given why they are inaccurate; but Senators never recognize any inaccuracy when they hold up the fact that there was a diminution of sheep along about the nineties, after the Wilson bill was passed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to add a word on both subjects which were previously discussed by the Senator from Rhode Island. The question is whether it is impossible with modern apparatus to report at the custom-house the exact wool contents of a cloth containing wool. The Senator from Rhode Island says it is not. I say to you that it is. Within the last few years we have installed there apparatus by which in more than one way the exact wool contents of a piece of cloth can be determined with accuracy. You can do it without chemicals by merely taking the cloth, removing the wool fibers from a square yard of it, and weighing them; and that is done every day, according to the testimony of Mr. Clark, the expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor engaged in this textile-industry business.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. Accepting the statement of the Senator, which I hope is correct, and have no doubt it is correct—

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator's confidence does not appear to be shared by his colleague from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. It certainly is not.

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to have the Senator permit me to finish the question. The Senator now states—and I say I hope it is true, and because of his statement I accept it—that it is possible by a chemical analysis to determine the quantity of wool in a given garment composed of wool and other material.

Assuming that to be true, what could be done in the way of a chemical analysis of the beautiful and tasteful necktie the Senator is now wearing should it appear for assessment at the custom-house? Would you put it through a chemical process, and then offer it for sale?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The present Treasury regulations require these materials to be accompanied by samples from which the character of these goods can be tested, and if they do not now sufficiently do so, it does not require very much ingenuity to require a dress presented here to be accompanied by an authentic sample of the material of which it is composed. In the case of ready-made clothing, however, it is not uncommon to take one suit of clothes and sacrifice it to the good cause of getting the duty accurately assessed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish again to say to the Senator from Iowa that no man living can take a piece of woolen cloth that is manufactured as the great bulk of woolen cloths are manufactured in this country to-day, cut out a sample, pull out the fibers, weigh them, and tell the amount of the wool in a yard.

Mr. CARTER. Or quality.

Mr. DOLLIVER. We are not looking for quality just now.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that many times flocks, and I mean by "flocks" the shearings from a piece of cloth that has no fiber whatever, is fulled into cassimeres and put upon the back of the cloth to make up the weight.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That can not be accounted for by counting the threads evidently.

Mr. SMOOT. There are no threads in flocks; there is no fiber in flocks.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There must be fiber and thread in a piece of cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. They put it into the cloth to give it weight; it never was woven there; it never was in the thread.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should be glad if the Senator would wait a moment, as I desire to ask him another question. He can answer both propositions together.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well; I will answer later.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I put into the RECORD this morning the statement made by the textile expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor, who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in which he said exactly what I am now saying and told exactly how the business is done. I know that he told the truth, because in the humble office where I have been trying to transact a little good business for the last few weeks I have had the exact machinery and the exact chemicals by which every item of wool in any kind of cloth is almost instantaneously reported by the almost total destruction of all other contents of the cloth.

When I saw that done before me, when I found myself able to take a piece of cloth, partly cotton or other vegetable matter, and destroy absolutely the vegetable fiber, leaving undisturbed the wool fiber in a practically pure condition, I knew that the textile expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor told the truth when he said the custom-house is now equipped with adequate facilities to report with absolute accuracy the wool contained in every cloth that is in question there.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that I know, as well as he or any living man, that the wool fiber of a piece of goods can be determined by a chemical analysis. I have never disputed the question that the wool within the cloth could be tested as against vegetable fiber, and the Senator from Iowa can not say that I have ever said to the contrary; but I do say—

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the Senator's honored colleague from Rhode Island made a very elaborate statement that led people to think in that direction.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I said, and I repeat, that it is not practicable to attempt to make such an examination of goods coming into this country as to accurately define what the rates of duty should be.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, yesterday this question was discussed here. I said then that where a piece of cloth was mixed with wool and cotton the chemical test would show the amount of animal fiber and vegetable fiber in it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; the chemical test in that case totally destroys the vegetable fiber.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if it destroys it, what is left will show what was destroyed. That is the only way that it can be shown. I have tested thousands and thousands of pieces of cloth, and I say that no living man can take a piece of cloth and, as the Senator from Iowa stated, by pulling the fiber out and weighing the fiber tell the amount of wool that is contained in a yard of cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the Senator from Utah mind answering me a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Let me finish the answer to this question, and then I will answer any other question with pleasure.

As I said, woolen cloths are frequently made heavier by shearings or flocks being sewed in and fulled in the back. They full them in the texture; they are not woven in the cloth. The cloth is fulled from 72 inches to 54 inches, the flocks are fulled in between the threads and become part of the back of the cloth; but as soon as the fibers of the threads are drawn out they drop to the ground, and there is no fiber in flocks. But that is not what we are trying to get at here.

No foreign manufacturer would ever think of importing cloths into this country with cotton in them if they were to be subject to a chemical test. They would use rags, mungo, and waste of the lowest kinds that are of animal fiber, and no chemical test would ever show them. No one could show whether they were 80 per cent wool and 20 per cent animal fiber, consisting of wool waste, or 40 per cent animal fiber and 60 per cent wool. It is impossible for the Senator or anybody else to correctly make such a test.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am going to ask the privilege of resuming for a minute at this point.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I do not want to trespass upon the time of the Senator from Iowa, if he objects.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want the Senator to have a very full opportunity to go into this business, but it has a tendency to obscure the purpose of my remarks.

Mr. SMOOT. Not in the least.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Although I am glad to say it does not have a tendency to refute them. So I will ask to resume and will yield presently.

Mr. SMOOT. May I answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I shall be glad to have the Senator engage in a controversy with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SMOOT. The question that was asked by the Senator from Minnesota as to the 100 per cent amendment of the Senator from Iowa, and also by the Senator from North Dakota, is a fair one, and perhaps upon its face looks absolutely just. But let me call attention to what the result of that might be and would have been in the year 1902 if there had been this limit of 100 per cent, as by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is put to this section, which means all the wool schedule and would take in all the wool schedule, as the amendment provides. This would be the result: If wool had a duty of 11 cents on it as it has to-day, and the foreign price of wool was 11 cents, then there would be 100 per cent on the wool and not one single solitary cent protection for the manufacturers of goods. What would be the result?

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the 100 per cent stands at the custom-house, and no manufacturer of foreign goods could approach that custom-house without getting ready to pay his 100 per cent on the goods.

Mr. SMOOT. He has an advantage right there, upon the price of the wool, of 100 per cent, and so if it stands there what advantage would it be to the American manufacturer? None whatever. The result would be that instead of shipping wool here, the manufactured articles would come in.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the Senator from Utah contend that under the amendment of the Senator from Iowa woolen goods could be shipped in here by paying a duty equal only to 100 per cent on the price of the wool itself?

Mr. SMOOT. I claim that if wool, as it was in 1902, was down to 11 cents—and I want to say these medium wools were in bond in New York that year for 10½ cents—if that were the case, then there would be no protection whatever for our manufacturers as long as we had 11 cents duty on wool. That is exactly what this amendment would amount to if perchance the wool should drop to that price to-day.

Mr. CLAPP. Suppose wool dropped to any price. Do I understand the Senator to say that the manufacturer of woolen goods under this amendment would have no protection except the 100 per cent on the wool itself?

Mr. SMOOT. If the amendment that the Senator from Iowa has offered was adopted, they would not have.

Mr. CLAPP. That is what we are discussing—the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just what I say. If only 100 per cent was upon the wool alone, then the American manufacturer would have no protection upon the manufacture of the goods.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator has just admitted that the American manufacturer would be protected on his manufactured article by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, without reference to the 100 per cent on the wool itself.

Mr. SMOOT. No; Mr. President, I never in the world admitted that, but said just to the contrary.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I ask the Senator again if he means that under this amendment, if wool was worth only 11 cents a pound—

Mr. SMOOT. In a foreign country.

Mr. CLAPP. In a foreign country—

Mr. SMOOT. And 22 cents here.

Mr. CLAPP. And cloth was imported into this country worth a dollar a yard, the only duty would be 11 cents, because that would be 100 per cent on the wool. If that is not so, then there is nothing to the argument.

Mr. SMOOT. I say this: If wool in a foreign country was 11 cents, and we had to pay here 22 cents for the same grade of home wool, then that is 100 per cent the manufacturers start out against them in manufacturing as against the foreign competitor.

Mr. CLAPP. In manufacturing foreign wool.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the difference?

Mr. CLAPP. We are protecting the domestic wool.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the difference if the price here is 22 cents for the domestic wool?

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Minnesota think it would be desirable so to arrange these duties that the goods would all come in in manufactured form, as they certainly would under his suggestion?

Mr. SMOOT. They certainly would.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the foreign manufacturer buys his wool at 11 cents and the American manufacturer pays 22, and there is not an adequate protection upon the woolen cloth, of course all the wool will come in in manufactured form. That is perfectly obvious.

Mr. CLAPP. Undoubtedly; but that is not the scope of this amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Absolutely.

Mr. CLAPP. It can not be.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is my judgment.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. As an illustration of the peculiarities of the woolen schedule, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa—for it is no use to call the attention of anyone else—to paragraph 376 in the bill, which is paragraph 368 of the Dingley law.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To what paragraph does the Senator refer?

Mr. NELSON. Paragraph 376, on page 131, being paragraph 368 of the Dingley Act. That provides, and the law is identical:

On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar description and character of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable material with the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 7 cents per square yard.

In that case, when a piece of cloth of that kind comes in, they have to determine whether the warp is all cotton or vegetable fiber.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They have; unless the Senator from Utah is there on the spot to convince them it can not be done.

Mr. NELSON. And they have to determine as to the filling, whether there is any wool in it. They have to separate the filling from the warp in that case.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They would be fairly successful in that if they could keep the Senator from Utah away.

Mr. NELSON. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to a further fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Utah will please rest quietly while I am talking to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; I am resting.

Mr. NELSON. I read from Tariff Notes:

Importations of women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and similar goods, the warp consisting wholly of cotton or other vegetable material, the remainder of the fabric consisting wholly or in part of wool: Value, \$2,950,121.95; duties, \$2,959,029.76; ad valorem, 100.

A little over a hundred per cent on a cloth where the warp itself was entirely cotton and where there could not by any possibility have been more wool than just the filling. Would not that amount practically to a duty of 200 per cent, or nearly that, on the wool in the cloth?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It requires a sort of aerial system of navigation to tell exactly what that would amount to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me for a moment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that the fact that there was \$2,900,000 worth of these goods imported, upon which a duty of \$2,900,000 was assessed, is the very best evidence in the world that under existing conditions that duty is not excessive.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That importation was an insignificant item compared with the vast item of domestic production within that line of business, as the Senator from Rhode Island well knows.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope so.

Mr. SMOOT. The intimation, of course, was that the Senator from Utah had in some way denied the fact that a cotton warp could be determined. I never have stated that it could not be determined. I never have stated that wool filling could not be determined. Anybody knows that it can be determined, but that is entirely different from determining the quality as to the woolen thread, whether it is waste wool or pure wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator will also do me the credit of saying that I never pretended that there was any process which would report the various grades and values of the wool contained in cloth or anything else, except the wool fiber itself. That is all I have contended for, and I am anxious to have these duties, which purport to be compensatory to the people who have lost money by reason of buying American wool, assessed upon the basis of the wool content of the cloth, for the very purpose of avoiding appearance of humbuggery and deception as well as extortion that is involved in the situation in which we now live.

That has another advantage. As I said the other day, this inability to sort the character of cloths, classifying the wool-fiber content in it, makes this bill as I propose to amend it practically as high as the Senate bill, so far as goods are concerned actually of wool and not taking into account the character of the wool. This simply undertakes to prevent the assessment of the wool compensatory duty upon cotton cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. In further evidence of what the Senator from Rhode Island said in relation to every piece of cloth being tested—and it would require the testing of every piece of cloth—I want to say that I have made cassimere for one clothing manufacturer with 15 per cent of cotton, and have made exactly the same identical pattern of cassimere with all wool in it. The price was different, but no one on earth could tell the difference from looking at the cloth, and no one could tell without testing it by a chemical test. Therefore any foreign manufacturer could have a hundred looms running, and he could have half of them running on all-wool goods and the other half on the goods with 20 or 25 per cent of cotton. Those goods could be shipped in the same identical bale, and unless they were tested, and every piece of them tested, no one would know or could tell whether it was all wool or whether it was part cotton.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does not the Senator know that only 1 package out of 10 imported is sampled and examined now in the appraiser's department, and if that package is found to correspond to the invoice the consignment is passed by the customs officials as correct? Is not that taken as conclusive?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; if—

Mr. DOLLIVER. If all the packages of imported goods were sampled and examined, no building could be put up in New York large enough to accommodate the transaction which the Senator seems to think is necessary in connection with imported merchandise.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator had better reverse that, and say that would be the case if his amendment were accepted here. I am perfectly aware of the fact that under the present law the administration of goods entering here is such that one sample of goods out of a case or bale is sufficient; but if the Senator's amendment was accepted here every piece would have to be tested, and there would not be buildings enough, as he says, in New York for the purpose.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On the contrary, a very simple Treasury regulation, such as I shall offer in a moment as an amendment, would make it just as simple to assess these woollens upon this basis as to tell whether silk is gummed or ungummed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask a question of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator gave an illustration from his own business a moment ago, in which he said he had made a piece of cloth; what was it?

Mr. SMOOT. Cassimere.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Which had 15 per cent of wool in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; of cotton.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Cotton; and then another one of exactly the same pattern of all wool. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. All wool.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yet the Senator had the benefit of the compensatory duty on the one containing 15 per cent of cotton, precisely as on the one containing all wool. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. I am very glad—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I am going to follow it by another question.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not correct from the very fact that I stated, when I stated the circumstance, that I sold for less money the goods containing 15 per cent of cotton than the goods of all wool. Therefore I did not take advantage of the compensatory duty.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The compensatory duty, as I understand, is based upon the supposition that there are about 4 pounds of wool in 1 pound of cloth. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct as a supposition, but sometimes it takes more than that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me until I ask a question. Then I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island one perhaps.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will be glad to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know, but the illustration that the Senator from Utah gave is a little bit troublesome. Both of these pieces of cloth, both of which were supposed, so far as the theory of the compensatory duty is concerned, to be all wool, were operated on precisely alike by the compensatory duty, if they were operated on at all. There is plainly 15 per cent of error, to put it very mildly and kindly; and does not the Senator from Utah think that something ought to be done to correct such a situation?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that he is wrong again when he says—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If I am wrong, I am taking the Senator's own statement.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Senator will acknowledge it. He says there is a difference there of 15 per cent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You said that.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no. There was 15 per cent of cotton in the piece of goods. Yet it took just as much work—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not talking about work.

Mr. SMOOT. It was finished just in the same way; it was pressed in the same press; and there was upon it all the work that it took to make the all-wool piece of goods.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the compensatory duty is not based upon the work or the press or anything else. It is based upon the amount of wool, and the Senator said he made one piece of cassimere that contained 15 per cent of cotton and the rest wool, and another one of precisely the same pattern that contained no cotton and all wool. There was, on the Senator's statement, a discrepancy of 15 per cent, and yet the compensatory duty, which is based upon the supposition that the piece contains all wool, operates on both alike.

Mr. SMOOT. If they were sold at the same price—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It operates regardless of the selling or the work or the labor or any of the rest of the elements the Senator has spoken of, because it is based upon the matter of wool.

As a matter of fact, since the Senator from Utah will not answer it, I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will be very glad to answer.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It was in my mind a moment ago. I listened to his argument, demonstrating to his satisfaction that the proposition was objectionable because it was not practicable to test how much wool was in a piece of cloth. But the Senator from Iowa immediately followed that by a statement that he had seen the operation under his own eyes. He further followed that by the statement that at present the method is to require—or it could be done—an examination of a sample of the various goods that come in. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island this question: Assuming that this method is practicable, does not the Senator think it would be better to have the compensatory duty based upon the actual amount of wool in a piece of cloth, instead of upon the incorrect assumption that it is all wool, when it is not? I ask that question upon the assumption that it is practicable to do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Indiana evidently has not read this schedule, or perhaps any paragraphs in it, if he supposes that the compensatory duty in all these paragraphs, as applicable to all kinds of woolen goods, is four times the amount of the duty put upon first-class wool.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, no.

Mr. ALDRICH. What does the Senator think is the compensatory duty as fixed in the different paragraphs? Will the Senator explain that?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish the Senator would not get away from my question by bringing up here something else.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I listened to the Senator's very plausible statement that the chief objection to the method as proposed by the Senator from Iowa was that it was not practicable, for various reasons which he advanced. That was followed immediately by the statement of the Senator from Iowa that he had actually seen the process before his own eyes, and therefore he personally knew it could be done. So my question is confined to this: If the Senator from Rhode Island should happen to be incorrect about its not being practicable, and if the Senator from Iowa is correct in saying it is practicable, would it not be a fairer thing, a better thing? The Senator can answer that yes or no, or as he pleases.

Mr. ALDRICH. The compensatory duties in this schedule are graduated according to the percentage of wool which is probably in the cloth. To use the illustration which the Senator from Utah has used, a cloth which had 85 per cent of wool pays a different compensatory duty from a cloth which has 15 per cent of wool, according to the value of the cloth. These provisions in regard to compensatory duties are very complex in their character. They have been figured accurately as to the value of the goods. There are scores of compensatory duties in these various paragraphs, if the Senator from Indiana would take the time to examine them. This idea that 4 pounds of wool would apply in all cases is very misleading.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. It applies to only a very small percentage of the importations; and in the other paragraphs the percentages are fixed according to the value of the goods, and the value of the goods is regulated by the amount of wool in it. These goods which contain 15 per cent of wool and 85 per cent of cotton would probably pay 20 cents a yard difference. Some of these goods pay only 7 cents a yard and others 44 cents compensatory duty. The compensatory duty runs, as I have just stated, from 7 cents to 44 cents to the yard, and that difference in compensatory duty is fixed by the value of the goods, and the value of the goods is fixed by the percentage of wool in almost all these cases.

The Senator from Indiana will see that if we adopt a new scale of compensatory duties, the whole schedule has to be turned upside down and adjusted according to this new schedule, because the value of the goods is not dependent entirely upon the proportion of wool that it contains. That might be the very worst test of the value of the goods. For instance, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, it might in one case be composed of flocks, of waste, or of any kind of material which is of the lowest possible value, and in another case it might be composed of all first-class wool. I say again, a test dependent only upon the proportion of wool to the entire fabric would be extremely misleading.

Now, beyond that, the value of these goods depends upon the other materials as well as upon the wool contained in them. They might be silk, for instance. A cloth might be composed of wool and silk—of a mixture of wool and silk—when the silk itself would be more valuable than the wool—three or four times, four or five, eight or ten times as valuable as the wool. To undertake to fix the compensatory duty upon that single element of all these elements which go into the values of these various cloths would be most unreasonable and most inaccurate—that is, if we want to assess these duties as we should, with a spirit of fairness over the entire scale.

The proposition of the Senator from Iowa turns the whole woolen schedule into chaos and confusion, and I venture to say that no expert in the world could within the next three weeks or the next three months undertake to readjust this schedule along the lines which the Senator from Iowa has suggested.

Now I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I certainly do not mean to question the purpose of any Senator, but it does so happen that whenever we ask a question we never can get the attempt at an answer directed to the question itself. It may not be wise to base the woolen schedule upon the wool itself, but I take it that the compensatory duty on woolen goods is measured in relation to the wool and not in relation to the cotton. The Senator from Utah stated yesterday a piece of goods which might be called "woolen goods" might have a percentage of cotton in it and yet be just as valuable as though that percentage of cotton was in fact wool. If that is true—

Mr. SMOOT. Wool waste.

Mr. CLAPP. Wool waste. I do not care what you call it. If that is true, then the Senator from Indiana is absolutely right—that if two pieces of goods were of the same value, and one of them contained 15 per cent of cotton, the compensatory duty protecting both of those pieces of goods would be absolutely the same amount, although one of them had only 85 per cent of wool.

I am not discussing at this time the wisdom of this. I am discussing the question of the Senator from Indiana, and I say again, he is absolutely right. If the prices of the two pieces of goods are the same, though one of those pieces may have 25 or even 50 per cent of cotton in it, in the woolen schedule it is protected and compensated by the same identical compensatory duty as though every fiber was wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? Suppose there are two fabrics, one containing 75 per cent of pure wool, clean wool, and the other containing 75 per cent of rags. Does the Senator think they ought to pay the same compensatory duty?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the whole question.

Mr. CLAPP. But I do think the compensatory duty levied in the woolen schedule should be limited to the wool and not apply to cotton.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is exactly what this schedule does and always has, by levying twice in one case the amount of duty upon first class, two and a half times in another case, three in another, and four in another, all based upon the idea that a certain percentage of wool appears in these fabrics. The whole schedule has been arranged precisely upon that basis.

Mr. CLAPP. With reference to the value of the goods, not with reference to the proportion of wool in them.

Mr. ALDRICH. Because the value of the goods—

Mr. CLAPP. Admit that—

Mr. ALDRICH. Because the value of the goods is the only test which experience has shown could be applied. That is the reason.

Mr. CLAPP. It is the only test that has heretofore been applied.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is the only test that now can be applied.

Mr. CLAPP. That may be, but nevertheless the Senator from Indiana and myself are correct when we say that under this woolen schedule a compensatory duty based on wool may apply to goods made in part of cotton, and pay the same duty if that piece of goods happened to be of the same value of another piece made entirely of wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is undoubtedly true. That is always true of any specific duty which covers a wide range of goods and a certain range of value. It must always apply unequally. There is nobody here who denies that or doubts it. Of course you can not make a specific rate unless you want to have thousands and thousands of items in these schedules. You can not make a specific rate of duty which would apply to every piece of cloth that was imported. You must have certain provisions as to value and as to the character of the goods. Under the present law the test of value is the test of the proportion of wool contained, and I say that is the only practical test that can possibly be applied.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, just one word further. In the illustration given by the Senator from Minnesota, two pieces of goods of equal value, one containing 50 per cent wool and the other 100 per cent waste or anything, no matter what it consists of, are subjected to the same compensatory duty, and does it not amount practically to just that much more duty upon such cotton as may be in it? Is it not an additional protection to cotton, under the guise of wool, when cotton has already been protected highly?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Indiana is taking a practically impossible case. Suppose it were possible, which could not be true—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Suppose it possible; something else might happen.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let me suggest to the Senator from Indiana why it is not possible. If one cloth contains 85 per cent cotton and 15 per cent wool, and another cloth contains 15 per cent wool and 85 per cent cotton, the value would not be the same, and could not possibly be. That is out of the question. So the Senator is speaking about a case which never could arise.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, will the Senator answer a hypothetical case, although it is based upon the direct statement of the Senator from Iowa? Suppose there are two pieces. One of them contains a certain per cent of cotton, the other a certain per cent of what you call waste—wool waste. Does

it not follow that you give the cotton the full protection in addition?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the fabric was composed in part of cotton and in part of wool waste, those facts would fix the value high enough, the foreign value as well as the domestic value, and it would be assessed for duty in proportion to that value, at a rate based upon that value. That is the only test, I say again, that can possibly be applied.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So we are all agreed, so far as this class goes, that the compensatory duty depends, after all, on the amount of cotton. The cotton is determined by the price. The price therefore is the test as to the amount of cotton in it, and the purpose in determining the compensatory duty according to the price is to determine how much cotton there is in it. Now, that being the case—

Mr. ALDRICH. That does not follow at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did not the Senator say that?

Mr. ALDRICH. It might be cotton or anything else.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I meant to say that the amount of wool was determined by the price. The price is the test as to the amount of wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator should have put the proposition the other way. The wool determines the price, not the price the wool.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; it is a question of testing the amount of wool in a piece of goods, which is determined by the price. So it reduces itself to the fact that the only test is the amount of wool which is in the piece of goods on which what we are trying to determine is the price. Now, the question, it seems to me, is whether that is the best and the most accurate test. The Senator from Iowa says that the exact amount of wool in the piece of goods can be scientifically determined. If that should be true, if that is practicable, would not that be the better and more just method, because it must be apparent even to an uneducated man, and I confess I am one, that the price could not accurately measure the amount of wool? It has been demonstrated here by exact figures—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is mistaken on two points. In the first place, it is not possible practically to determine with such—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Iowa said he had seen it under his own eyes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Everything can be done in a laboratory if you have time and space enough.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand the Senator will not answer the supposititious question, which is based on the direct statement of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will answer it in a moment. I say in the first place this method of assessing duties is not practical; and if it were practical, I will say that, if the proportion of wool contained should be shown by a chemical test, it is not an accurate test of the value of the goods, and can not be in the nature of things. Seventy-five per cent of waste or 75 per cent of pure wool would be assessed at the same duty, and that certainly is not just or accurate or proper as a basis for the collection of duties.

So, if even the Senator's first contention was correct, and I say it is not, his last contention would fall, because it does not afford an accurate test of the value of the goods.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, the 8th of this month, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] made a statement that shortly before that time the price of wool had dropped from 21 to 12 cents a pound. I asked the innocent question whether the Wilson tariff law had anything to do with causing that drop. I think it was a very pertinent question, for the reason that everything that has happened wrong in this Government since 1892 has been attributed by the Republican party to the Wilson tariff law, which was enacted on the 28th day of August, 1894. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] offered to answer that question by saying that wool, during the existence of the Wilson tariff act, was sold in his State at from 4½ to 6 cents a pound. I did not think that that was relevant to the question that I propounded. I do not suppose that the Senator from Wyoming thought so. But that was the best that could be answered.

I have here the prices of wool, given in the American Wool and Cotton Reporter for January 2, 1896, which was a part of the time when the Wilson tariff law was in effect, and it does not show that in Wyoming any wool was as low as 4½ or 6 cents a pound; but the lowest was from 7 to 9 cents a pound.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Are the prices given there the prices in Wyoming or the prices on the market?

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes, sir; and the prices all over the country.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator may rely upon the Wool and Cotton Reporter, but I will produce, if he will give me time, certificate after certificate showing the exact amount of money received from an exact amount of wool; and in some places it went down as low as between 4 and 5 cents a pound to the grower, loaded on the cars, for the entire clip.

Mr. McLAURIN. Of course there may have been straggling instances of a very inferior grade of wool that went down as low as 4½ cents, but this American Wool and Cotton Reporter published—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. McLAURIN. In one moment. It is published by Frank P. Bennett & Co., of Boston, Mass., and is considered an authority.

Mr. WARREN. By the Senator from Mississippi. But would he put a published price-current list from a Boston newspaper against the accounts of sale in actual transactions in Wyoming?

Mr. McLAURIN. I think it is an authority all over this country. It certainly is not a free-trade journal. It is a protective journal and protective people edit and publish it.

Mr. WARREN. At present; but let me say to the Senator—

Mr. McLAURIN. At that time.

Mr. WARREN. Yes. Let me say to the Senator, first, that I have seen the Wool and Cotton Reporter probably almost since its first issue came out. I know the gentleman he speaks of well, and I have known him for many years. I know something of the wool market. I want to say to the Senator, without any reflection upon Mr. Bennett or his paper, the Cotton and Wool Reporter, that clips which sold for less than 5 cents during the time mentioned have since been contracted for on the sheep's back at as high as 24 cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. I can hardly understand how those clips that were sold for 6 and 7 cents could have been contracted for afterwards on the sheep's back. But, aside from that—

Mr. WARREN. The Senator evades the question.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not begging the question.

Mr. WARREN. He understands what I meant. A clip for the year 1907 would be loaded on the cars and perhaps bring 5 cents a pound, or even less. The clip from the same sheep the following year might bring an entirely different figure, and it would be the same clip, in the way we speak of such matters.

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes, Mr. President. Here is the American Wool and Cotton Reporter, devoted exclusively to this business, in Boston, Mass.; 530 Atlantic avenue, I believe, is where they do business. This book gives the price of these articles every year. It is a paper that is edited, and it gives the price every year; and here is the price that is given as the lowest price in Wyoming in 1896. There is one article of wool here as low as 7 to 9 cents, another from 8 to 11 cents, and another from 10 to 12 cents in the State of Wyoming. The lowest that is given is burred and defective wool in the State of California, that is from 6 to 7 cents. There is wool here that is quoted as high as 17 to 18 cents in the States of Texas and Georgia.

I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate, but I ask to insert this in the Record without reading it. It will give the prices of these wools, and I think that even the Senator from Wyoming may rely upon it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it may be that I shall have to go to Boston and to some building on Atlantic avenue to find out what the prices of wool have been in Wyoming, but I want to say to the Senator that the prices of wool in Wyoming have been as I stated. While most of those men who were compelled to take 5 and 6 cents were so ashamed of such a low price that they might hesitate about producing their vouchers, I can, nevertheless, show invoice after invoice, return after return of accounts of sales from men who do business along the same avenue, Atlantic avenue, in Boston, in proof of the low prices I have indicated, and which will show that the figures the Senator is now asking us to accept as the rule in Wyoming are totally and absolutely wide of the facts, so far as prices of Wyoming wool in Wyoming are concerned. But, Mr. President, the price of Wyoming wool in Boston would, of course, show 2½ to 4 cents increase, on account of transportation, commission, and other charges, the railroad freight alone costing 1½ to 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. McLAURIN. I was just wondering how high the Senator from Wyoming would be to have to go down to the seventh story of a building in Boston.

Mr. WARREN. It depends upon how low down I would have to go to get to the low price of wool.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not in favor of free wool; I favor a revenue tariff on wool; but I am not in favor of a tariff on manufactured goods and then a tariff on wool, and then adding another tariff to the manufacturer to compensate him for the privilege that he gives to the Congress of the United States to tax wool. That is what is meant by a compensatory duty.

Mr. WARREN. I have no doubt but that the Senator legislates always as honestly as it is possible for the Senator from Wyoming or any other Senator in this body to legislate.

Mr. McLAURIN. These are statistics that I think are reliable. I ask unanimous consent to insert them in the Record without reading them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Mississippi will be complied with.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Quotations of leading grades of wool in the seaboard markets.

[From the American Wool and Cotton Reporter, January 2, 1896.]

WASHED CLOTHING FLEECES.		Cents.
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia XX and above	19	-20
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia X	17½	-18
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia No. 1	21	-22
No. 1, ½ combing	22	-23
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia No. 2	22	
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia coarse	22	
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York X and above	16	-17
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York No. 1	20	-21
No. 1, ½ bleached, combing	21	-22
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York No. 2	21	-22
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York coarse	21	-22
WASHED COMBING AND DELAINE.		
Fine delaine, Ohio and Pennsylvania	20	-21
Fine delaine, Michigan and Wisconsin	18	-19
No. 1 combing, ¾ and ¾ bleached	22	-23
No. 2 combing, ¾ bleached	22	-23
Coarse combing, brushed	21	-22
UNWASHED COMBING.		
¾ blood	17	-18
Kentucky, Indiana, and similar wool, ¾ and ¾	18	-19
Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin	17	-18
Coarse, braid	17	-18
UNWASHED LIGHT AND BRIGHT.		
Ohio and Pennsylvania fine, unmercerized	15	
Michigan and New York fine, unmercerized	13	-14
Ohio and Pennsylvania fine, unwashed	14	
Michigan and New York fine, unwashed	12	-13
¾ blood unwashed	16	-17
Kentucky, Indiana, and similar wools, ¾ and ¾ bleached	17	-18
Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin	16	-17
Coarse, unwashed	15	-16
Bucks	9	-10
TEXAS, GEORGIA, AND LAKE.		
Spring, 12 months, choice	12	-13
Spring, average	11	-12
Spring, 6 to 8 months	10	-11
Fall choice	10	-11
Fall average	9	-10
Georgia and lake	18	-19
CALIFORNIA.		
Northern spring, free	12	-15
Middle country, spring	11	-12
Southern spring	9	-10
Burry and defective	6	-7
Free fall, northern	11	
Free fall, southern	10	
Defective, fall	6	-7
OREGON.		
Eastern Oregon, choice	12	-13
Eastern Oregon, average	10	-11
Eastern Oregon, heavy	9	-10
Valley Oregon, No. 1	13	
Valley Oregon, No. 2	15	
Valley Oregon, No. 3	15	
TERRITORY.		
Idaho fine	10	-11
Idaho fine, medium	11	-12
Idaho medium	12	-13
Kansas fine and fine medium	11	-12
Kansas medium	14	
Wyoming fine	7	-9
Wyoming fine, medium	8	-11
Wyoming medium	10	-12
Utah fine	10	-11
Utah fine, medium	12	-13
Utah medium	14	-15
Dakota fine	11	-12
Dakota fine, medium	12	-13
Dakota medium	14	-15
Montana fine, choice	12	-13
Montana fine, average	11	-12
Montana fine, choice medium	13	-14
Montana fine, medium average	12	-13
Montana medium, choice	14	-15
Montana medium, average	13	-14
Montana low	15	
Washington fine	8	-10

	Cents.
Washington fine, medium	10 -11
Washington medium	11 -12
Colorado fine	9 -11
Colorado fine, medium	10 -12
Colorado medium	12 -13
Colorado coarse	10 -12
Southern Colorado and New Mexico, unimproved	12 1/2-14
Southern Colorado and New Mexico, improved	13 -16

ARIZONA.

Heavy clips	8 -9
Average clips	11
Strictly choice	13

WESTERN AND ORDINARY PULLED, SCOURED.

Extra and fine A	32 -33
A lambs	30 -31
B lambs	26 -27
C lambs	20 -23
No. 2	15 -18
Combing, nominal	28 -30

CHOICE BRUSHED, SCOURED.

Extra and fine A	34 -36
A lambs	31 -32
B lambs	28 -29
C lambs	23 -25
Combing, nominal	29 -30
Fine combing, nominal	32 -33
California finest	33 -35
California second	30 -32
California defective	20 -30

FOREIGN.

Australian:	
Combing, choice	21 -24
Combing, good	19 -21
Crossbreds	22 -24
Clothing	18 -20
Choicest clothing	21 -24
Cape and Natal	14 -16
Montevideo	15 -16
South American, pulled	27 -29
English coarse	24 -26
English 3/4 to 1	25
Canadian combed, fleece	25 -26
Canadian combed, pulled	26 -27

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise for only a moment to say that it strikes me that the most unique argument advanced against any amendment to this bill is the argument advanced by the Senator from Rhode Island. In substance it is that the wool schedule is of such a complicated character that you ought not to change it in any particular, because that would involve a revision of the whole schedule.

Mr. President, I was foolish enough to believe when this session of Congress met that we were to revise the tariff, and if there was any one schedule in the whole tariff bill that needed revision it was the woolen schedule. The cotton schedule is a very complicated schedule, but perhaps not as much as the woolen schedule. Yet the Senator from Rhode Island found no difficulty in advancing and changing the duties in the cotton schedule. I think if the Finance Committee had given their attention to the wool schedule they could have had an opportunity, and the Senate would have given them an opportunity, to consider that schedule. It will not do to come in and say that this schedule is so complicated, so artistic, so artificial, that to meddle with it in any particular now would involve a revision of that schedule, and we have not time to go into that work now; that it should be done at some future time. There is always a future time in the eyes of some people when we attempt to make reforms. They are always postponing the work of reform. So here we have been told in reference to the woolen schedule: "To be sure there may be incongruities in it, but it is too late to do anything now; we will have to postpone it to some other time."

Now, that, it seems to me, is not such a revision of the tariff as the Republican party contemplated and assured the people of the country of in the last campaign.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I have only a word or two to say in response to the suggestions of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN]. The statements which I made as to the price of wool and sheep were based upon my own personal knowledge and not taken from any trade journal. I know what was offered for wool at the period to which I referred in 1896. I saw 2,000,000 pounds of wool at Mountain Home, in Idaho—and I can give the specific facts—that were under shelter waiting for a market, and I saw the wool buyer who was there for the purpose of securing the wool. I talked with him. I saw a number of wool owners who live there. I saw the proprietor of the warehouse in which the wool was sheltered. I gained my knowledge from those people. The best offer for that wool,

which was a high-grade wool, was 6 cents a pound. I made personal inquiry in order that I might know facts from the original party. The parties at Mountain Home did not sell it for 6 cents a pound, but that was the best offer they got. I spoke to them that night and I told them to hold on to their wool, that the Republican party was coming into power and that conditions would be restored under which their wool would be worth a great deal more. So far as those people were concerned they did not sell the wool.

I went to Caldwell, in the State of Idaho, on the line of the road, and I saw practically the same conditions, with approximately the same quantities of wool. I saw those men in conversation with the would-be purchaser. I knew him and talked to him and talked to the men, and I gave them the same advice, and there was a great deal of that wool that was held over until the price had advanced and the people were able to market it. There were some people who were so situated, financially, that they could not carry their wool over, and they sold it for what they could get. Some borrowed enough money upon the wool to enable them to carry it. But the picture I gave the day before yesterday in regard to the conditions of the wool market there was not taken from any Boston trade journal.

Mr. WARREN obtained the floor.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. McLAURIN. If the Senator from Wyoming has the floor I will wait until he gets through. I wish to make one or two remarks in reference to what was said by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator wishes, I will yield now.

Mr. McLAURIN. I just want to say that the Senator from Idaho has been late in giving us this disquisition on the wool market in his State during the time of the Wilson law. He did not undertake to do that day before yesterday when this matter was up. That which brought out the controversy was this language of the Senator from Idaho:

I saw wool not very long ago drop from 21 cents to 12 cents.

Now, that is what was said by the Senator with reference—

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McLAURIN. Just wait a moment. After a colloquy had occurred between the Senator from Wyoming and me, the Senator from Idaho said:

I will call his attention to figures, however, which have been handed to me. In 1896, 38,298,183 sheep sold for \$65,167,735; that is, they were averaged at that; and in the year of grace 1907, 53,240,282 sheep had a value of \$204,210,129. A mere inspection of the figures is sufficient.

That is what he said.

Mr. HEYBURN. That was eleven years after the period—

Mr. McLAURIN. That is all right; but the point I want to make is that the Senator has given his testimony as to the price of wool during the time of the existence of the Wilson law. That testimony he did not give day before yesterday, and I guess it ought to be closed out, because it is not in rebuttal, and he ought to have put in all of his direct evidence in his case.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator permit me at that point?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. The price to which I referred, which was in 1907, was double the price that wool was at the lowest point under the Wilson law.

Mr. McLAURIN. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho in his statement is correct as far as he knows anything about it in his State, in his neighborhood; but in opposition to his information and his knowledge about it I put on record the American Wool and Cotton Reporter—

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will permit me just a moment, the price to which wool fell under the financial disturbance of nearly two years ago was the result of the financial condition of the country at that short period of time, but it revived so quickly after the Republican party had readjusted the finances of the country and brought about the change that probably a very small quantity of wool, if any, was sold at that reduced price.

Mr. McLAURIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he meant two years ago during the panic when he said it dropped not long ago from 21 to 12 cents?

Mr. HEYBURN. I referred to a period two years ago or thereabouts.

Mr. McLAURIN. As I understood the Senator day before yesterday, the remedy was applied overnight, and the whole trouble was cured the next morning.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was speaking within the range of the liberty of speech. I was demonstrating a position, illustrating a point, and the language was sufficiently applicable. So I do not feel called upon to state how many days or hours we were considering the financial measure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. McLAURIN. With the Senator's permission, I will yield in just a moment. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if wool remained at the price of 12 cents until the rearrangement by the Republican party of the financial laws of the country?

Mr. HEYBURN. It did not happen to be at a time of the year when wool was being sold. The wool had been marketed at a very much better price, from 16½ to 18½ cents, which is always a good price for wool.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator, the minimum in one case was in the neighborhood of 4 or 5 cents during the panic and advanced to 8, 9, 11, 12, or whatever the statement made by the Senator, according to the class of wool and where it was.

Mr. HEYBURN. While I used 1906, it was true in 1905 and it was true all the time that the Wilson-Gorman law was in force. I do not mean those exact figures, but as the market became exhausted or drained the price of wool went down; the herds had decreased, and there was nothing to bring it up until the absolute assurance contained in the duty provided by the Dingley law, which brought confidence to investment, confidence to the owners, and confidence to the purchasers of the product.

Mr. McLAURIN. Does the Senator understand that the Wilson law was in force in 1905 or 1906?

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Mississippi, I know, does not intend to draw schoolmaster lines. Of course that was an inadvertence of speech. We were speaking all the time of when the Wilson-Gorman law was in effect, which was in 1894-95, and since, and until the Republicans changed it in 1897.

Mr. McLAURIN. I thought the Senator just a while ago was speaking of the time of the panic of 1907.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not think the Senator's mind is at all confused as between those periods or as to the application of my remarks to the respective periods.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator's mind is not confused. It is a matter of the confusion of language by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WARREN. I have observed with no particular apprehension the system of reform which prevails here. I am a friend of reform. I am myself a reformer. The reform my friend the Senator from Iowa seeks to effect is one that I hope he will be successful in demonstrating; that is, this test of wool and woollens was easily made here in the Senate from the testimony of a Senator, but it is very difficult practically.

I will be glad to join the Senator when that time shall come when those who have practical knowledge of the subject can accept his theory; but it seems to me, Mr. President, that we ought to be guided somewhat by experience at all times, and certainly if we are about to effect a radical reform.

Now, if I shall give no offense to certain Senators present, and there are none whom I respect more, I may say that, regarding this proposed test, "I am from Missouri, and I have got to be shown." I go back to the experience of this country in the various tariff laws; I have searched them carefully, and they go back as far as 1790. After trial, up to 1816, the tariff law of that year was fixed to apply to such materials as we are now discussing under this amendment, as "manufactures of which wool is the material of chief value." We had long years of trial under that, and in 1824 the tariff read "of which wool is a component part." We have gone on, tariff law after tariff law; we have followed that along, and our friends on the other side, to whom I hope I give no offense, in their tariff law of 1894 made it read the same way, notwithstanding the same law made wool absolutely free. They were so certain that the tests ought to be applied in the way of assessing the duty on manufactured goods, where wool was a component part, that they used the same language respecting this particular section. All the other sections applied the same way to cloth that was made of part wool; in other words, they assessed the same duty upon an article in which wool was a component part, whether it was 1 per cent or 99 per cent wool.

So I say to my esteemed friend from Iowa—whom I expect to follow some time when he has got his reform sufficiently complete so that we may possibly swallow it—that I would rather trust to the Nation's experience that has been passed along to us, and been tried satisfactorily by both parties. I would rather wait until we have got more than the approval of one Senator, to whom some specialist has been able to demonstrate in the Senator's committee room that it is possible to determine under some circumstances whether certain goods contain a bit of wool or a bit of cotton or some substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when the name of Mr. PILES was called). My colleague [Mr. PILES] is paired for the remainder of the day with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY], with whom I am paired, has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. LODGE. Having a general pair with that Senator, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. WARREN (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Mississippi has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. I wish an arrangement made, so that he may stand paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] for the remainder of the day. I say that, of course, in case the Senator remains away from the Chamber, as I understand he has left for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	Culberson	Hughes	Owen
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter
Beveridge	Davis	La Follette	Rayner
Bristow	Dolliver	McLaurin	Simmons
Brown	Fletcher	Martin	Smith, Md.
Burkett	Foster	Nelson	Stone
Chamberlain	Frazier	Newlands	Taliaferro
Clapp	Gore	Overman	Taylor

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	McEnery	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bailey	Daniel	Lodge	Shively
Bourne	Elkins	Money	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Piles	Tillman
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Wetmore

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 135, line 12.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the pending paragraph may first be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the paragraph is agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The amendment which I offer is an extra paragraph. I shall not ask to have it read, as it is administrative in character, and calculated to throw some light upon amendments that have previously been voted upon, which, but for the appearance of this amendment in the RECORD, might be a little obscure. As I have said, I shall not even ask to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the proposed amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Page 135, after line 12, insert the following:

"3913. All invoices of manufactured or partly manufactured articles subject to duty under this schedule shall specify separately the quantity of wool contained in every such article, and duty shall not be assessed upon a less quantity of wool than so stated in the invoice, and any such article concerning which the invoice does not specify the

quantity of wool shall be assessed as if composed wholly of wool. This schedule shall take effect ninety days after the passage of this act, and until that time Schedule K of the act approved July 24, 1897, entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States,' shall remain in full force and effect."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, I desire to return to paragraph 370, with a view of offering an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be necessary to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which that paragraph was adopted; and I ask that the vote be reconsidered, for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to offer his amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] should be acted upon one way or the other.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not desire to have anything more done with the amendment than to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which paragraph 370 was agreed to? The Chair hears none. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa to that paragraph will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the paragraph it is proposed to strike out the period and in lieu thereof to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in no event shall the duty on any of the foregoing articles in paragraphs 368, 369, or 370 exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to say that those paragraphs are the ones which assess the duties upon by-products of worsted manufacture, what are commonly called "wool extracts" and "wool wastes." One of the most pathetic complaints made to me—and I confess that it has touched my sympathies considerably—is the fact that the framework of our duties on wool is such that only the wools of the lighter shrinkage can be imported, thereby excluding a large part of the woolen-manufacturing interests of the United States from the right to participate in the foreign wool market, and leaving them to supplement the shortage of their home supply for manufacturing purposes by buying where they can noils and these various forms of wastes and wool extracts. They claim that the men who make these wastes are the men who are competing with them for the privilege of selling goods in this market.

They say, with a force that has greatly impressed me, that the law ought not to leave them to be dealt with on the extortionate terms of those who are interested in a business which, according to many statements that have been made here, has in some way practically extinguished the profits of the carded woolen manufactures, the knit-goods manufactures, and other of the more humble forms of woolen-goods manufactures in the United States. They say—and I stand ready to make their statements good—that the rates which we have fixed on these wastes, or some of them, rise to an incredible equivalent ad valorem percentage. They are willing to pay as much on these wastes as the equivalent ad valorem which people are called upon to pay on wool, but they do not like to be compelled to buy of their competitors the necessary materials of their craft protected by a rate higher than we have been accustomed to assess on wool itself.

Consequently, I have drawn that little amendment, attaching it to paragraph 370, and providing that these wool wastes shall be assessed just exactly as this bill assesses them, but that none of the articles mentioned in these paragraphs shall, in the aggregate, bear a duty in excess of 60 per cent. That equalizes them and places that level of charge and assessment high enough adequately to protect all interests and to deliver them, so they say, out of the hands of their adversaries.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator might just as well extend his amendment to include all the wool of all the farms and ranches of the United States as to include only these so-called "wastes." It must be remembered that these wastes are a product of scoured wool, superior to the scoured wool itself, except as to noils.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And rags.

Mr. CARTER. The rags of the world we do not desire to invite into the market or into the clothing of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the Senator's amendment does not apply to rags exclusively. It takes in quantities of wool advanced in the cost of manufacture beyond the scoured stage, and reduces the duty of 11 cents a pound on wool of the first class in certain

market conditions to less than 5 cents per pound alleged protection. That reduction would bring us to a point in the wool-growing industry in this country which would be no better than free trade in wool, because the one would destroy the flocks as quickly as the other.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Montana says would be true if the facts back of his statement could be verified; but the truth is that the equivalent ad valorem upon wool is now 45 per cent—not more, and possibly less—and it would be a godsend to States like Montana and Wyoming if they could be sure that they would have 45 per cent on the value of their wool standing all the time between them and the foreign imports of wool into the United States. But I can demonstrate that this simple scheme of wool assessment takes away from the good people in Montana and Wyoming what it appears to give them, and that in reality I would be conferring a blessing upon Montana if I could secure to every sheep husbandman there an authentic, bona fide ad valorem of 45 per cent on the wool that enters the market of the United States. I do not desire to mix that question up, although if the Senator from Montana desires, I will offer another amendment and ask that they be considered together. It might embarrass me if they were both adopted; but they might as well die peacefully in the same transaction. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the same place the following proviso:

Provided, That in no case shall the duty upon wools, wool wastes, noils, or any of the foregoing articles in the previous paragraphs of this schedule exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the representatives of the woolgrowers have always believed that an indirect attack, through wool duties, upon noils and similar products would be fatal to the wool duties, and I agree with them.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if I am correct in understanding that the maximum which he puts upon wool, according to his own statement, exceeds the present duty on wool by 15 per cent?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It does; but it is the maximum. I do not desire to interfere with the actual wool duties that are collected.

Mr. BACON. Is it 15 per cent in excess?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is the maximum. I am trying to equalize the duties. We have got here on wools at a given rate an equivalent ad valorem of 45 per cent, and yet in the same bill the wool wastes cast up, many of them, in the process of manufacture are assessed at a higher rate than the assessment upon wool itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that if the price of wool should drop in a foreign country to 15 cents, under a maximum ad valorem duty of 60 per cent a pound, we would only have a duty of 9 cents on wool, instead of 11 cents; and when wool is low is the very time that the woolgrower wants his protection. I certainly hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the first amendment. I shall not press the second.

Mr. OWEN. Before the yeas and nays are taken I should like to submit a table giving the actual market value of wool from 1885 to 1907, as compiled by Messrs. Mauger and Avery, of New York. I submit this table for the purpose of showing, in connection with the argument made against the suggestions which I submitted in regard to the relative cost of labor to the gross product in the matter of woolen yarns and blankets, that the value of wool has not changed in such a way as to make any substantial difference in the relation of the labor cost toward the gross product of the material; in other words, the cost of wool which has been washed was, in 1898, 29 cents for fine wool and 34 cents in 1907, a change of 5 cents a pound only. The tables of Carroll D. Wright were made up as of 1898 and were printed in 1897, so that his figures on the cost of materials will show a comparatively small variation in the price of wool in 1898 and 1897.

I submit also a table of labor cost, showing that the increased labor cost to 1906, as far as the tables are brought up, was a little more than the increase in the price of wool. So that the ratio submitted by Carroll D. Wright's tables will not be modified in any degree whatever by the change in the price of wool as compared with the change in the labor cost.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the tables will be printed as requested.

The tables referred to follow.

Market value of wool, 1885 to 1907.

NO. 193.—FINE, MEDIUM, AND COARSE WASHED CLOTHING OHIO FLEECE WOOL IN THE EASTERN MARKETS: PRICES AT THE BEGINNING OF JANUARY, APRIL, JULY, AND OCTOBER, 1885 TO 1907.

[Data furnished by Messrs. Mauger & Avery, New York.]

Year.	January.			April.			July.			October.		
	Fine.	Medi- um.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medi- um.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medi- um.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medi- um.	Coarse.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1885	34	33	29	32	32	28	32	31	28	33	35	32
1886	35	36	32	33	34	30	33	33	29	35	38	34
1887	33	38	34	33	37	33	34	37	34	32	36	34
1888	31	35	33	31	34	33	29	33	31	31	34	31
1889	34	38	33	33	37	31	35	39	32	33	37	31
1890	33	37	29	32	36	29	33	37	29	33	37	31
1891	33	37	31	32	37	31	31	35	29	31	35	30
1892	30	35	31	29	34	31	28	34	30	29	33	29
1893	29	33	29	30	32	31	24	26	25	23	24	21
1894	23	24	21	21	23	20	20	21	18	19	21	19
1895	17½	20	19	16½	20	18	18	21	19	18	21	19
1896	19	21½	19	19	21	18	17	18	17	18	19	18
1897	19	21	19	21	22½	20	21½	23½	21	27	29	25
1898	29	30	26	29	29½	25½	28	29	24½	28½	30	24½
1899	26½	29	24	25½	28	24	29	31½	27	31	33½	29
1900	35	36½	31½	32½	35½	30½	28½	31½	27½	26½	28½	26½
1901	27	29	26	25	27	24½	25	26	22	25	26½	23
1902	25½	26½	24	25	26½	24	26	26½	25	28	28½	25½
1903	30	31	27	29½	30½	26	31½	31½	27	32	31½	28
1904	33½	32½	29½	33½	32½	29½	32½	32½	30½	32½	33½	31½
1905	34	35	36	34	36	36	36	39	36	35	35	34
1906	34	38	36	34	38	36	33	37	36	34	38	33
1907	34	39	36	34	38	36	34	36	35	35	38	34

NOTE BY MESSRS. MAUGER & AVERY.—This table exhibits in a concise form the prices of the three grades of a standard domestic fleece wool in the seaboard markets at the beginning of each quarter. In its present shape it is deemed to be intelligible to all interested in wool. In the special features of character and condition, "washed Ohio fleece wool" is less subject to variation than any other description, and thus is more a basis of value than any other class. Wool, owing to its wide variety, difference in character and condition, and liability to shrink in cleaning, is precluded from speculative operations which apply to products which may be dealt in as "futures." For these reasons the prices of wool are not liable to the same changes as cotton, wheat, etc.

Wages and hours of labor.

NO. 109.—WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR: PER CENT OF INCREASE (+) OR DECREASE (−) IN 1906, AS COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS, IN EMPLOYEES, HOURS PER WEEK, WAGES PER HOUR, FULL-TIME WEEKLY EARNINGS PER EMPLOYEE, RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, AND PURCHASING POWER OF HOURLY WAGES AND OF FULL-TIME WEEKLY EARNINGS PER EMPLOYEE, MEASURED BY RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, 1890 TO 1906.

[From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. Computed from the relative figures shown on page 210.]

Calendar year.	Per cent of increase (+) or decrease (−) in 1906 as compared with previous years.						
	Employ- ees.	Hours per week.	Wages per hour.	Full-time weekly earnings per employee.	Retail prices of food, weighted according to family consump- tion.	Purchasing power, measured by retail prices of food, of—	
						Hourly wages.	Full-time weekly earnings per employee.
Average 1890-1899.....	+42.9	−4.6	+24.2	+18.5	+15.7	+ 7.3	+2.4
1890.....	+50.7	−5.3	+23.8	+17.3	+13.0	+ 9.6	+3.9
1891.....	+46.9	−5.1	+23.8	+17.6	+11.5	+11.1	+5.5
1892.....	+44.1	−5.1	+23.2	+17.0	+13.5	+ 8.5	+3.0
1893.....	+43.8	−4.9	+23.1	+17.1	+10.8	+11.1	+5.7
1894.....	+51.9	−4.4	+26.9	+21.3	+16.0	+ 9.3	+4.5
1895.....	+48.2	−4.7	+26.3	+20.4	+18.3	+ 6.8	+1.8
1896.....	+44.9	−4.4	+24.6	+19.1	+21.2	+ 2.8	−1.7
1897.....	+41.6	−4.2	+24.7	+19.5	+20.1	+ 3.8	−.6
1898.....	+34.3	−4.3	+24.0	+18.6	+17.2	+ 5.7	+1.2
1899.....	+27.5	−3.8	+21.8	+17.1	+16.3	+ 4.7	+ .7
1900.....	+23.6	−3.3	+17.7	+13.8	+14.4	+ 2.8	−.6
1901.....	+20.0	−2.8	+15.0	+11.9	+10.0	+ 4.5	+1.7
1902.....	+15.6	−2.0	+10.7	+ 8.5	+ 4.3	+ 6.0	+4.0
1903.....	+13.0	−1.2	+ 6.8	+ 5.5	+ 4.9	+ 1.8	+ .6
1904.....	+13.7	−.5	+ 6.2	+ 5.6	+ 3.6	+ 2.5	+2.0
1905.....	+ 7.0	−.5	+ 4.5	+ 3.9	+ 2.9	+ 1.4	+1.0

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the pending amendment the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are taken I desire to say another word, which I overlooked. This amendment does not propose to fix any rate; it fixes a maximum rate, beyond which the assessment shall not go. In many cases the specific rate as reported by the Senate committee will be less than this maximum rate; but in the case of the cheaper varieties of noils and many varieties of these wastes, if we allowed the specific rate to stand at 10 cents, as the Senate committee has fixed it, the equivalent ad valorem would be something fabulous and very oppressive to these good people. Therefore I merely include this maximum limitation, so that in the calculation of these specific assessments, when they rise above 60 per cent, these two lines that I put in will stop it there, thereby not only reducing it somewhat, but equalizing it throughout the schedule.

Now, I want to say another word—

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator passes from that, the point he was on, I wish to know if I understand him correctly. I understand the Senator now to say that, while the 60 per cent maximum does exceed by 15 per cent the average of the duties on wool, there are some duties collected under the specifics which rise above 60 per cent. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the amendment upon which the vote is about to be taken does not allude to wool, but is confined entirely to noils and wool by-products.

I would like to have the attention of my friend from Montana [Mr. CARTER]. There has never been an hour in my life that I have not been interested in the prosperity of the section of the country which has been honored for so many years by his public service. I am a frequent visitor there. I have become attached to its people. I have been especially attached to them, because it seemed to me when I first went there that they were making

a hard fight. In those twenty years a great many changes for the better have occurred. Irrigation, increase of population, variety of agricultural pursuits—all these things have combined not only to fill up the country with good people, but to put a great variety of industries upon a sound footing. I have studied their interests, and I shall never cast a vote here that would injure or prejudice that great community between the Rocky Mountains and the ocean, which, within my own lifetime, has taken a distinct place on the commercial and industrial map of the United States.

I want to say to the Senator from Montana, to his colleagues, and to all those who are associated with him in taking care of the interests of that great community, that they are not being taken care of under the tariff act of 1897. On the contrary, in the Senate Chamber within this very week they are being put forward to apologize for impossible propositions. Every representative of the worsted mills has fallen to the rear. Speeches have been made by these great thinkers and students, speeches requiring days and weeks of preparation, and they have not been accorded even the poor compliment of the attendance and attention of men who are using them in this Chamber to defend this historic humbug called "Schedule K" in the tariff laws of the United States.

I want to tell them exactly what has been done to their woolen interests, and I reduced it to writing in the midnight hour last night in order that I might make it brief, and that it might at least get a reading if it does not get a hearing in the Senate of the United States.

The scoured-wool rate of 33 cents per pound is a delusion and deception, for, of course, no wool would be imported in its scoured condition and pay a duty of 33 cents per pound when it can be imported at 11 cents per pound, regardless of its value or shrinkage, which is equivalent to only about 16 to 20 cents per scoured pound. In fact, I am advised by numerous wool experts that on most of the imported wool the duty of 11 cents per grease pound will only amount to about 19 cents per scoured pound, owing to the light shrinkage of the wools imported by the worsted manufacturers. It is manifest, therefore, that, inasmuch as the present duty of 20 cents per pound upon noils is based upon the supposition that a scoured duty of 33 cents per pound is paid, when in fact only about 19 cents is paid, the proper duty on noils should be based upon the actual average duty per scoured pound collected and not upon an imaginary duty. If 20 cents per pound were the proper rate for noils, based on the scoured pound duty of 33 cents per pound, the proper rate for noils, based upon the actual average duty paid per scoured pound of only 18 cents, would be 10 cents per pound.

For many years I have wondered why the sheep industry has been languishing in the United States. I have pored over the statistics, and every now and then I find that twenty years ago we had more sheep than we have now. Every now and then I find a year when the wool production was greater than it is now. I called in experts to advise me, people capable of interpreting wool statistics.

They told me things I feel I ought to communicate to the Senate. They state as a statistical proposition that the wool industry in America, instead of being helped, has been crushed and ruined for practical purposes by this obsolete and nearly forgotten statute of 1867, which has become so sacred in our jurisprudence that nobody dares to look at it and nobody can inquire into it without being ordered out of the party which he has loved and served all the days of his life.

What has become of the sheep of Pennsylvania, of Ohio, of West Virginia, of Virginia, of the Middle West, of Iowa, of Minnesota? What has become of that great industry? It has moved to the West, and you can not even interpret the census statistics about sheep because when you state that the pounds of wool have increased along comes some practical man and says, "Yes; the pounds of wool have increased, because on the sandy areas of the Southwest the wool has accumulated pounds upon pounds of sand that enter into these statistics of the wool product, as produced by the pound, in the United States." I say, for practical purposes—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I take it for granted the Senator, after having so pathetically mentioned here what we all feel a great deal of sorrow over—the disappearance of sheep in the Eastern States and some others—would not willingly remove them from the few States left that can produce them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am about to offer an amendment to give

an inducement to the return of sheep not only to the West, but to the East.

Mr. WARREN. Furthermore, let me say, the Senator may have better information than I, but I had pretty early information. I know I am an older man than the Senator. I am sure the wools of this country way back many years ago were calculated, so far as they grew here, on an average shrinkage of 66½ per cent, and upon that basis this 3 to 1 scoured wool ratio was established. That, taking it altogether to-day, is just about the shrinkage of American wools. Some wools that may be imported skirted and selected may shrink as low as 20 per cent, but there is no regular wool product of any country on earth that is imported here or that can be imported which shrinks very much less than 35 per cent, and from that up to a shrinkage of even more than the shrinkage of wools of this country, which I have mentioned.

I want the Senator to tell me, if he will, whether he has had any delegations of woolgrowers here who insist that we shall submit to some new process of establishing what the ratio shall be through this chemical operation with which the Senator has amused himself during the summer evenings lately?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have not had delegations here. I have had a good many letters from woolgrowers, and I put into the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings a very intelligent letter by a very bright man, the president of the Woolgrowers' Association of the State of Minnesota. I do not know that I am called upon to produce witnesses here about this matter. I know that the carded-woolen industry is here, by as able manufacturers as ever came into the corridors of this Capitol, asking that certain things be done and certain evils be remedied, and I know that instead of being received kindly, as they should have been received, they have been received with indifference and with affront by the Finance Committee, or, at least, by members of the Finance Committee, as I called to the attention of the Senate the other day in a little colloquy with the Senator from Utah.

They feel not only that they have been denied a hearing, but that they have been denied that respectful consideration which men ought to have whose business is being destroyed by the laws of the United States.

I hold in my hand a letter, which I received not very long ago—

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator right here allow me to ask him a question regarding the letter which he introduced yesterday, and which he says made complaint? If I correctly heard that letter read, its chief complaint was against allowing importation at lower duty of the very products that the Senator now wishes to come in cheaper, and advocated that they should bear a higher duty.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If my friend understood that to be the complaint of the letter, he shows himself to be a very poor interpreter of correspondence.

Mr. WARREN. The RECORD will show.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask the Secretary to read the letter I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want the country to know—

Mr. WARREN. Is this the letter the Senator had read yesterday?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I expect the Senator from Wyoming not to interrupt the serenity of my situation here. It is not the letter of yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to have it read again.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should dislike to have it treated with the very poor attention it received yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to have it read again to determine whether my interpretation or that of the Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Let the Secretary read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE LEICESTER AND CONTINENTAL MILLS COMPANY,
Germantown, Philadelphia, June 9, 1909.

HON. JONATHAN P. DOLLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I desire to commend you for the stand you are taking in the interests of the carded woolen manufacturers, and trust you will be able to do us some good. In reading over the Daily Trade Record of June 9, I notice in your debate in the Senate, when you explained that the carded-wool manufacturers were mad at the Senator from Utah, and that the Senator from Utah stated "if the men reported such a tale, they reported something that never happened." I desire to state that the Senator from Utah is mistaken; the occurrence that you rectify did happen, and in my presence, during one of the visitations by the carded woolen manufacturers to the Senate committee. This was in April. The first knock-out blow that we received at that

time came from the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. The writer of this letter asked to see the Senator from Pennsylvania before the manufacturers came before the committee. The Senator came out of the committee room where I met him, and introduced him to Mr. M. D. Ring, who can verify my statement. After introducing myself to the Senator, and also introducing Mr. Ring, I stated my object in appearing before the committee, and asked him to do all he could to help us, stating to him the deplorable condition of the woolen trade (not worsted), and that we needed assistance at the hands of the committee in order to keep our mills running and to make a living. The Senator from Pennsylvania kindly told us, and these are his exact words, "Well, Brown, if you folks can't make a living in the business that you are in, get out of it and go into something else." I replied to the Senator that that was simply impossible without losing all capital and all money that we have been struggling to get together for years, but if they would give us the proper legislation there would be no necessity for us getting out of business, but there would be work not only for the woolen manufacturers, but also for the worsted man.

As for Senator SMOOT, during the meeting in the Senate Finance Committee room he tried to cast every obstruction in our way and prevent us from getting a square hearing, and in fact was reproved by one of the Senators, who said he would like to hear the woolen manufacturers, and requested Mr. SMOOT to keep still a little while so that we could be heard. The Senator from Utah was not quite as blunt as our friend from Pennsylvania, but he did say, "Why do not you do as I intend to do, and that is to put in worsted machinery?" If the Senator could remember all that was said to him he could readily recall my answer to him, which was, that we did not all have as much money as he to do such things and had to hold on to our woolen machinery, and trust to the assistance of our Representatives to help us in our business.

You will pardon me for trespassing upon your time, but when the Senator from Utah desires to cast reflections on the manufacturers, who have been treated as we were treated, I think it about time that somebody stated the true circumstances of the case. You can use this letter as you wish, as I can back up these statements with witnesses and dates.

Very respectfully, yours,

EVERETT H. BROWN.

Mr. DOLLIVER. These complaints and anxieties of a great community of business men in the United States have not alone come to me from Pennsylvania, but from very many States and from nearly every section of the United States. I have had a good many weeks' struggle to make it understood that I am not here as an enemy of the protective tariff. I am not here for the purpose of so framing this measure as to injure American industries. Every word I have uttered, every amendment I have prepared and submitted to the Senate has had for its purpose to give more work, not less, to American workmen, more business to the American people, and to bring back to these industries that have languished under our laws that prosperity and success to which they are entitled under the equal administration of a tariff system.

I ask the Secretary to read this letter, handed to me to-day by the honored senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MANKATO MILLS COMPANY,
Mankato, Minn., April 10, 1909.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since the receipt of a copy of the Payne bill we have been studying the woolen schedule, and we are convinced that in its present form it is most unsatisfactory to the carded woolen industry of this country. Apparently the wool schedule in the Payne bill is practically the same as it was in the old Dingley bill, and the injustice of this schedule lies in the fact that a specific duty is placed upon wool without any reference whatever to the shrinkage of wool.

If there must be a duty on wool, and if that duty must be a specific one, then we can not understand why it should not be based upon scoured wool instead of wool in the grease, although there is no question that under the present schedule, as well as the proposed schedule, the worsted manufacturers of this country can certainly have no cause for complaint.

There are no worsted mills in the State of Minnesota that we know of. There are, however, a few woolen mills, and it is in the interest of these mills that we are writing you to-day for the express purpose of showing you the rank injustice that is being done to the carded woolen industry under the old as well as the new proposed tariff.

A specific duty of 11 cents per pound on wool in the grease amounts to a very light tax per scoured pound on wool of light shrinkage. On wool that shrinks only 15 per cent, this 11 cents per pound specific duty is equivalent to 13 cents per scoured pound. This light-shrinkage wool is the wool that the worsted manufacturers use. On the other hand, on wool that shrinks 80 per cent, which is the only wool that can be used in the manufacture of woolen goods, this same specific duty of 11 cents per pound is equal to 55 cents per scoured pound. Do you not see the injustice of this schedule?

The worsted manufacturer is compelled to use long-staple combing wool, and it is these wools that have a very light shrinkage. It is a fact that the very unsatisfactory condition of the carded woolen industry of this country to-day is due, in a large measure, to the absolute unfairness of the present wool schedule. To make matters worse for the carded woolen industry, the present, as well as at the proposed new, tariff imposes a duty on all by-products of the American worsted manufacturer. We refer to noils and worsted waste.

While the new bill proposes a reduction of 2 cents per pound, compared with the old Dingley bill, the duty is still so high as to effectually keep out foreign noils and worsted waste. In our minds, therefore, an 18-cent duty is just as prohibitive as a 20-cent duty on noils and worsted waste.

We would like to see the by-product of worsted manufacturer, mentioned above, put on the free list if possible, and the duty on wool reduced and changed so that heavy shrinkage wools will not be dutiable to as large an extent as light shrinkage wool. On the other hand, so far as a duty on our own product, woolen hosiery, is concerned, we are perfectly willing to see the duty taken off of woolen hosiery manufac-

tured in foreign countries, providing those countries do not impose any duty on woolen hosiery made in the United States.

There is no question but that a most unsatisfactory state of affairs exists to-day in this country so far as the carded woolen industry is concerned. We would be very glad indeed, were such a thing possible, to take the money we have invested in this business and loan it at 5 per cent per annum, rather than continue to run our plant, as with the margin of profit becoming less and less each year, there is apparently very little future for anyone who continues to manufacture woolen goods.

We trust, therefore, that in view of the facts above stated, it will be possible for you to use your influence toward procuring a decided reduction of the duty on noils, worsted waste, etc., and also a readjustment of the wool schedule which will be at least fair to the carded woolen industry of this country.

Yours, very truly,

MANKATO MILLS COMPANY,
MUNSON BURTON, Vice-President.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I think the desire of the writer is perfectly plain. He wants free wool, if he can have it, or free noils rather, which amounts to the same thing. Every pound of noils displaces 2 or 3 pounds of wool in grease, according to the shrinkage of the wool, and it is a case where the manufacturer wants his raw material free, either that which comes from his competitor in noils or from the farmers in grease wool. He wishes to make prices on noils and raw wool and yet retain the right to make his own prices upon his own product.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is not necessary for me to say that I do not accord with the opinion expressed in the letter that noils, or wool either, should be free. That is not the chief matter in the letter. That is a matter of minor consideration. The statement he makes is that the duties are so arranged as to practically exclude his branch of the business from an interest in the foreign market.

Mr. WARREN. It does show he has no consideration for the farmer or the man who raises the sheep.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That far I do not follow him. I stand for both. I want to equalize the situation. I want the farmer adequately protected and the manufacturer adequately protected and the rates so adjusted as to equalize burdens between all classes of people interested in this matter in the United States.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask the Senator whether he would permit me at this time to have read—they are quite short—resolutions of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not think they belong in the few remarks I am engaged now in delivering.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator read a letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia bearing on this matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator desires to—

Mr. PENROSE. I will postpone it until another time. I thought it was pertinent to these remarks.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Let it follow immediately. I know what some of the manufacturers in Philadelphia want; but if they were unanimous in Philadelphia on your side, I would have had a great deal more leisure in the last sixty days.

I desire the Secretary to read a telegram coming to me to-day from a woolen mill in Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MANKATO, MINN., June 9, 1909.

Hon. J. P. DOLLIVER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Your stand on wool schedule, unassailable from every standpoint except to users of imported combing wools, in whose interests we all believe the tariff is designed. It is incredible that any woolgrower could be deluded into belief that his interests and those of manufacturers using foreign wool could be identical, for every pound imported displaces that much American wool to greater extent than shoddy or waste. If they think high tariff so good for them, reverse the position of the worsted and carded manufacturers; let the former enjoy a prohibitory tariff for a while in place of the latter to extent of per cent the carded people now pay, and give carded people per cent the worsted people pay. There will be practical demonstration present tariff has blighted the carded-wool industry and enriched the worsted manufacturers, making luxuries pay less tax than the cheaper grades.

MANKATO MILLS COMPANY.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment not to make noils and other wool waste free, but to fix a maximum ad valorem upon them, so that these good people who have to use them will not be confronted with a duty that is not only prohibitory, but 15 per cent in excess of the duties which we have assessed upon carded wools.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it would be ungracious in me not to recognize very fully and cordially, as I cheerfully do, the kindly words of the Senator from Iowa on the State of Montana and the people abiding there. I regret, however, that the compliment was followed by the advocacy of an amendment

which would cause the good people of that State to change their occupations about as radically as the Senator from Pennsylvania directed the carded-wool people to do.

The Senator's remarks would leave the Senate with the impression that this amendment merely fixes a maximum for certain rags and waste, products of the tailor shop, the rag-picker, and the worsted manufacturer. If any Senator will turn to the bill and scrutinize the paragraphs embraced in this amendment, he will perceive that the articles thus affected constitute a body of wool superior in quality to wool in the grease, to washed wool, and to scoured wool. Top waste, for instance, which he would have admitted at this reduced rate, is, as I have taken occasion heretofore to allege and now assert again, superior in quality to scoured wool, which is assessed at 33 cents a pound by this bill. It is wholly immaterial to the woolgrower how the duty is reduced if reduced so as to put him out of business.

The remarks of the Senator from Iowa and the letters presented in support of his observations here make it quite manifest that his inspiration, or that his point of view, if you please, upon the wool question is obtained from the manufacturers of so-called "carded wools." The people engaged in that line of business are entitled to consideration, undoubtedly; they are a worthy body of people; but the Congress can not in any manner, shape, or form stay the tide of changing fashions or the public demand for goods.

In 1867, when the structure of this tariff on wool was framed substantially as it is to-day, 99 per cent of the wool manufactured in the United States was manufactured by the carded-woolen process. To-day, owing to change of fashion and improvement of machinery, the manufacturers by the worsted process have largely driven the carded manufacturers out of the market. The wool crop of the United States, or three-fourths of it, is sold to the worsted manufacturers and about one-fourth to the carded-wool men. The carded manufacturers supplement their purchases of first-class and second-class wool by rags and shoddy and mungo and all kinds of wastes. None of these wastes can be used in the manufacture of what is known as "worsted cloth."

Now it is proposed by the importation of rags and shoddy and high-grade wool at reduced duty, to bring to the rescue of a failing industry the strong arm of the law, not to give equal terms, but to give unequal terms, because the law would be interposed in case this amendment should be adopted to stay the natural tendency of the people of this country to buy the best instead of the worst. The natural desire of the people of the country is to wear goods made of pure wool in the best fashion the manufacturing art has devised rather than to wear clothes made of rags, picked up through the streets of the cities, or the waste products of other manufacturing establishments.

Our people are rather particular in the kind of goods they buy. And let it be understood that the average farmer realizes the difference between a good article and a bad article. Let an individual attempt to sell a poor quality of farm machinery, be it a rake or a thrasher or a mower or a reaper, and he will soon find that the farmer demands the best and the latest pattern.

You can not to-morrow sell at any price a machine, though never used a day, if it is 2 years old in manufacture, because the farmer demands the up-to-date, efficient piece of machinery. It is so with his clothing. The manufacturers of the country who can supply the best will take the market, and the laws of the United States can no more stay that national tendency than they can control the currents of the winds or the movements of the tides.

Mr. President, the manufacturer from Minnesota, quoted by the Senator from Iowa, is a candid man who does not deal in concealment or evasion. What he desires is that these so-called "wastes" shall come in free, and he would go beyond that and have the wool itself free. If that view shall finally be determined to be in harmony with the wish of a majority of the American people, they can so pronounce in due time. But at this time our sailing orders require that we shall protect the farmer and protect the manufacturer; that we shall protect the American producer against the producer of any other country in the world.

Mr. President, I do not question the sincere desire of the Senator from Iowa to do that which is just and right toward the farmer and the sheep grower of the plains, but the natural effect of his action would be entirely at variance with his purpose in this respect.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What does my friend from Montana mean by that? He knows that the present duty on wool reduced to an equivalent ad valorem is 45 per cent. He knows that I have suggested a maximum here for the different by-products of cloth manufacture at 60 per cent. In what possible way could any

unfriendly result take place under such a proposition to the good people who are interested in sheep husbandry in Montana?

Mr. CARTER. Top waste and slubbing waste, together with roving waste and garnetted waste, all represent qualities of wool superior to scoured wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The quality of wool they represent depends upon the quality of wool out of which they are made.

Mr. CARTER. The original fleece, of course, gives the refined product in scoured wool, but the process of manufacture refines the wool still more.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Exactly; scoured, but the duty on scoured wool is only 33 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. The waste to which the amendment of the Senator is applicable is superior in quality to scoured wool, because the nolls are eliminated in the process of carding and combing, and it is of this final refinement of wool that top waste and the other forms of waste mentioned in paragraph 368 is composed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. By what process does the honored Senator from Montana get so excited about top waste, and yet seems placid and calm in the presence of an importation of 24,000,000 pounds of wool of the second class coming into the United States during the current year, at an average scoured assessment on the contents of the fleece of 15 cents a pound?

Mr. CARTER. I shall not divert my contention with the Senator as to his mode of procedure in this transaction.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me? The Senator from Iowa does not give the correct facts. I have not the figures for the last month or two, but when he says that for the current year the importation is at the rate of 22,000,000 pounds of second-class wool, he is about 100 per cent or a little more incorrect in his figures.

Mr. CARTER. That is a trifling per cent, as things go here.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The figures for 1907 were 12,000,000 pounds, but when the manufacturers began to come here last winter it indicated a stimulus of that trade to the amount of 2,000,000 pounds a month. If that should continue, it would be 24,000,000 pounds in the year.

Mr. WARREN. I have the figures in my committee room.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I would in the beginning have cooperated with the Senator from Iowa to somewhat better the conditions applicable to second-class wool. I do think now that the bill could be improved in many particulars, but if I had charge of its improvement I would not propose the amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa, who after all the paragraphs relating to compensatory duties on wools and the protective duties on wool have been applied has come at the close of the entire proceeding to strike down the woolen duties themselves after the compensatory duties have been agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I come back because I had hoped to get the other things done. If they had been done, I might not have come back.

Mr. CARTER. Of course, if the other things had been done it would probably not have been necessary to have come back. But the bill has been approved as to all things practically requiring compensatory duties, and now comes the Senator to change the base itself by putting a lid, if you please, upon the wool-grower above which he may not rise regardless of the shifting changes in the market price of wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the Senator from Montana permit me to make a suggestion at that point?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. He said that the act of 1867 was adopted at a time when the carded woolen business occupied the larger field of woolen manufacture, and that is true. But there is one thing that the Senator has overlooked. The few people who are in the worsted manufacturing business seemed to be a little sharper than some of the farmers from Ohio who spoke for the wool raisers' association. This increase was in a far-off period before the time of the Senator from Montana, as he will undoubtedly admit—

Mr. CARTER. Cheerfully admit.

Mr. DOLLIVER (continuing). And while the worsted interest was not very largely represented, the people who did represent it seemed to know more about what was being done than anybody else.

I sought information in all directions to find out how that linotype line happened to be dropped out of the paragraph describing the classes of wool so smoothly that you could hardly recognize its absence. It takes a man of some literary ability, it takes some repeated readings, before he can see that the effect of the language is to introduce these English combing wools washed at exactly the same rate they would pay if unwashed, whereas they pay a duty of 11 cents unwashed, and it is doubled if they are washed.

I asked everybody how that happened. I consulted the oracles, I read in books, I asked every elderly gentleman who looked as though he had ever been in the sheep business, if he knew anything about it. I finally got hold of a venerable man whom you will see sitting yonder in the corner listening to me now—the oldest expert in wool in America, a Philadelphia wool merchant, manufacturer, trader, general manager. Everything about the wool business he knows, and when he came into my office and began to talk with me, I said to myself there is a man who is worth talking to. Among the first things I said to him was, "Mr. Green, do you know anything about how that sentence happened to be dropped out of the tariff act of 1877?" A very benevolent smile came over the face of Mr. Green, and he answered in these words:

Q. Have you ever given any attention to the phraseology of the wool tariff?—A. I have.

Q. There is one thing in this wool tariff that I have not been able to understand—a good many things, in fact, but this one particularly. Why has the language been so arranged as to double the rate on wool of the first class which are washed and at the same time leave the original rate on wools of the second class whether they are washed or not?—A. In 1867 the only wools that were imported into this country of the first class were from the Cape of Good Hope and from South America, the latter called "mestizo." The Cape wool shrank from 60 to 70 per cent; the mestizo shrank from 65 to 75 per cent. That was practically two-thirds. Washed wool was taken then at 20 cents and unwashed wool at 10 cents.

He refers to the assessment upon the varieties of wool.

Q. You refer to the high shrinkage of wools. Now, in the case of the other wools of low shrinkage, the law seems to have made no distinction as to whether they were washed or unwashed?

Now comes the answer:

A. Mr. Edmunds, who was treasurer of the Pacific Mills, at that time the largest worsted mills in the country, said: "This will not do for me. I must use either English or Canadian wools." They are all washed; and while he had a compensatory duty based on unwashed, he succeeded in getting the duty on washed wool the same as had been put on unwashed. His mills were, and are now, located at Lawrence, Mass.

So, while there may not have been very many of these good people present they seem to dominate the situation with a shrewdness and sagacity that has deceived even the elect.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Montana permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. It is obvious that we can not dispose of the wool schedule and at the same time dispose of what might be called the "regular order" to-day, and as a number of Senators want to know what is to be done, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the income-tax amendment to the bill, which was fixed for to-day, be fixed for to-morrow as of to-day, or the same as to-day.

Mr. ALDRICH. With the same rights that it would have to-day.

Mr. BAILEY. With precisely the same rights in all respects.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to its going over to-day, to come up at any time when the Senator calls it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas asks that the income-tax amendment may be postponed until to-morrow, having the same rights that it has to-day. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, if the Senator will indulge me one moment, I have not wanted to interfere with the consideration and conclusion of this schedule; but as soon as the schedule is completed to-morrow, or if it is concluded this afternoon and to-night, then the first thing to-morrow I will call up the income-tax amendment; if the schedule is not concluded this afternoon or to-night, then as soon as it is completed to-morrow I will call it up.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate on the pending amendment further than to say that the adoption of this amendment will involve a complete recasting of Schedule K. There can be no adjustment at this time on the lines proposed by the Senator from Iowa. This is not a perfect schedule, and I know it; I realize very fully that it can be made more perfect; but, Mr. President, all legislation in the Congress of the United States, as in every parliamentary body in the world, represents but a consensus of opinion, a basis upon which men can actually accommodate their views one to another and abide by a result in order to obtain any result at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator think it desirable that the schedule should be recast, it being defective?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, any schedule passed by the combined wisdom of all the experts ever collected together will still be a defective schedule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be; but my question was whether the Senator thought it would be well to have it recast.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator will permit me to reply to him completely?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. Acknowledging the infirmities of the schedule, predicting that any schedule hereafter made to take its place will be defective from the point of view of some one, we accept this schedule as the best now obtainable, and accept it cheerfully, because under its provisions this great woolen industry has prospered, and its prosperity is sufficient vindication of the wisdom of those who framed the schedule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, then the Senator's statement amounts in the end to this: That, after all, it is about as good a schedule as human wisdom could get, since the Senator said that any schedule that was constructed by any human wisdom would still be defective. My question merely was, in view of his statement the other day, whether, if it were possible, he thought the schedule could be improved by recasting. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that he has not answered that question, and I would be obliged if he would answer it.

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to answer the question. I say to the Senator now that I could, by striking out a few lines and inserting a few lines in this wool schedule, make it a more perfect workable schedule from the standpoint of the wool-grower than it now is; but I venture to predict that 20 Senators would rise instantaneously and announce that there were other people in this country aside from woolgrowers who had some rights within the Congress and under the law. If our friend the manufacturer from Minnesota could have his way, he would put wool and woollens on the free list, and that would be, according to his judgment, a perfect and peaceful way out of this trouble, but it would be death to the woolgrower.

When wool goes to the free list I know that so many fortunes would be lost and so many homes would be ruined in the State I have the honor of representing in part that I would stand on this floor as long as I had the strength to stand here rather than suffer the adoption of any such amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So would I, Mr. President; but I call the attention of the Senator to the meaning of his words. He said that he himself by changing two or three lines and by striking out two or three lines could improve it from the point of view of the grower. The Senator from Iowa has demonstrated here with some clearness that he can improve it from the point of view of the manufacturer. Those two statements—

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to enter a protest against the Senator from Iowa as a representative of the woolen manufacturers.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He certainly represents some of them. Those two statements show that the schedule could be improved upon. Now, then, if it is true that it is ever to be recast, when will it be recast if not now?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And if we are not going to recast it now will not the same legislative situation the Senator suggested the other day meet us then, and thus will the time ever come when it will be recast? We are here now to do this work if it needs to be done.

Just one word more and I will sit down. I will join the Senator with as much earnestness as he about the proposition of being against any free wool. I have entertained that position ever since I was grown and I always shall until I am convinced to the contrary. But I have not heard any amendment here that proposes any such thing as that.

I renew the question as to whether the Senator does not think if the schedule needs improvement and can be improved upon that now is the time to do it; and if now is not the time to do it, will the time ever come, in the Senator's judgment, when the same objection will not be made?

Mr. CARTER. The schedules have been in some measure improved from time to time since 1867. This wool schedule from the woolgrowers' point of view represents the very best judgment of the most thoroughly enlightened men upon this subject it has ever been my privilege to know.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator said he could improve it himself.

Mr. CARTER. Judge William Lawrence, of Ohio, who aided by his counsel and advice in the preparation of the bill of 1890, and again the bill of 1897, understood the wool schedule from the woolgrowers' point of view better than any man of his time. He observed defects in the schedule as finally adopted, but he recognized what no one will dispute, that the schedules represented the best obtainable, rather than what anybody desired.

The Senator is aware of the fact, because he has used his influence to produce it, that there will be an amendment offered to this bill to provide for a careful scrutiny not only of these schedules, but of the whole mass of data upon which they are based, with a view to hereafter making recommendations which may lead to the harmonizing of the schedules, the filling up of the low places and the leveling down of the high places upon a proposed scientific basis.

I hope that commission or committee or bureau, or whatever it may be designated, may finally bring forward something of a more symmetrical and effective character than any of the bills that have been heretofore enacted by Congress. But Congress, in the last analysis, will be compelled to pass the bill, and the bill will represent in every case just what the votes of the two Houses make it. It will probably embrace, after the scientific experts have exhausted their skill and research, certain inequalities and certain features, which, from the point of view of those in one line of production, will be regarded as unjust, whereas the particular point of objection will be regarded as the chief element of perfection in the bill from another point of view. As long as men have varied and varying interests, the matter must ultimately be settled by three hundred and odd Representatives of the people in one House, and 90-odd Senators in this Chamber. The views of the commission will finally be filtered through the judgment of each body, and the bodies will represent the convictions and interests of the people of the respective districts and States. The bill framed by the experts, or on their recommendations, will be amended in Congress to conform to the average judgment of the American people as announced through the ballot box.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary read the resolutions of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, as requested, there being no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

MANUFACTURERS' CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Whereas the existing tariff law relating to wool and woollens, in conjunction with the general prosperity maintained by the protective system, has so developed woolgrowing and woolen manufacturing that we now produce about three-fourths of the wool and 95 per cent of the cloth required for clothing the American people, which clothing they buy at very moderate prices, as is evidenced by the fact that they wear more and better clothing than any other people; and

Whereas the old trick of the free-traders of endeavoring to separate the woolgrower from the manufacturer by changing the equitable arrangement of Schedule K in such manner as to admit into this market foreign products of wool at less than relative duties placed on raw wool, thus destroying the woolgrowers' market, is foreshadowed in the recent speech of Senator DOLLIVER of Iowa: Therefore

Resolved by the board of directors of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, That we call upon all Senators and Representatives in Congress who are loyal to the Republican party and its platform to stand unswervingly for the wool and woollens schedule as it now is in the Senate bill.

N. T. FOLWELL, President.
ELMER P. WEISEL, Secretary.

[SEAL.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to refer just a minute to a letter written by Mr. Brown, from Baltimore, and to the paper read by the Senator from Iowa. He charged that these carded-woolen people have been denied a hearing.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; they had a hearing, but, with the temperature reduced so low, it made a deep impression upon their feelings.

Mr. SMOOT. I took the words of the Senator down as he gave them, and of course I was referring to what the Senator said; but, as modified, I will proceed to state just what did happen.

The carded-woolen people were the only woolen manufacturers who appeared before the Finance Committee. They were given a hearing, and they had Mr. Dobson there to speak for them, and he made his statement to the committee. Not only that, Mr. President, but they asked that I meet with them the next day. I made the appointment in my office for 8 o'clock in the morning, and I spent over an hour with carded-woolen men from Maine and other States, going over the whole situation; and I have met them on two other occasions.

I thought I had given them a respectful hearing. I listened to what they had to say. I discussed the question with them as one having an interest in the business, telling them exactly where I thought the trouble was. It ill becomes Mr. Brown, it seems to me, to write a letter complaining that I have not given a hearing to him.

Mr. President, I want to say further that I have had my office full of men representing the interests both for and against, some mornings from 7.30 until after midnight, for week in and week out.

I do not believe there is an American citizen who has ever asked me to give him a hearing, if I had the physical strength to do it, that I have not listened to what he had to say.

Mr. President, I fully sympathize with the condition of the carded-wool people; and when they say now that the question of noils is the very thing that has brought them to this unhappy condition I want to tell them it is not true. In all my history as a manufacturer of wools I purchased only one single lot of noils in my life. I never used them but once. In the most prosperous years I ever had as a woolen manufacturer there never was a time but that I used almost pure wool.

I know what is the matter, as I have stated it to the Senate before. It is that the styles have changed. The American people are wearing worsteds instead of woollens. The improvement in machinery has brought this about. I believe that some time or other the styles will change again, and then the carded wool people will be successful once more.

Mr. President, I wanted to say this much in relation to the charge here of Mr. Brown from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BACON. The Senator offered two amendments. Which one is this?

Mr. DOLLIVER. This is the first offered. I offered the second for the information of the Senate and for the accommodation of my friend from Montana.

Mr. BACON. It is only the first that is now to be voted upon?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The first.

Mr. BACON. It does not include wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIGGS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. HALE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HALE] is detained at home by illness. If present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER]. He being absent from the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). The standing pair which I have with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who is absent from the Chamber on account of illness, has been transferred, so that he will stand paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], leaving me at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ALDRICH (when Mr. WETMORE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WETMORE] is unavoidably absent from the Senate to-day. He is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. My colleague, if present, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DEPEW (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], with whom I am paired, voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Maryland has not voted.

Mr. DEPEW. Then, I withdraw my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Chamberlain	Foster	Nelson
Bailey	Clapp	Frazier	Newlands
Bankhead	Clay	Gore	Overman
Beveridge	Cummins	Hughes	Paynter
Bristow	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	Stone
Burkett	Fletcher		

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegge	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	McEnery	Warner
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—25.

Bourne	Frye	Piles	Tallaferro
Briggs	Hale	Rayner	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	Tillman
Culberson	McLaurin	Shively	Wetmore
Daniel	Money	Smith, Md.	
Depew	Nixon	Smith, Mich.	
Flint	Owen	Smith, S. C.	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the paragraph.

The paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] presented last night for printing a very valuable report of one W. A. Graham Clark, and it has been ordered to go into the RECORD. The National Association of Wool Manufacturers made a careful analysis of that report, and I will ask that it also may go into the RECORD, so that we may have the benefit of their ideas upon the same subject, as they all tend to a betterment of the woolen condition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming will be granted.

The paper referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1909.

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the bitter attack which Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, has made upon American wool manufacturers and their industry, using as justification for his charges a recent report and testimony of Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, special agent of the Department of Commerce and Labor, it seems both just and necessary that there should be laid before the Senate and printed in the RECORD the analysis of Mr. Clark's report and testimony prepared by the tariff committee of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Senator LA FOLLETTE has stated, in substance, that Mr. Clark was selected with the knowledge and approval of American manufacturers, and that he was repudiated by them only because the results of his inquiry abroad were not favorable to their interests.

As a matter of fact, the wool manufacturers of this country were not consulted in any way about the appointment of Mr. Clark as an expert to examine the wool industry of foreign countries. He was selected entirely without their knowledge, and he was totally unknown to them. When it became noised about that Mr. Clark was to present a report on the wool industry, this association had considerable trouble in ascertaining the identity of Mr. Clark, for no one had ever heard of him as being associated with the woolen business.

Indeed, Mr. Clark had never spent an hour of his life in the woolen business. He had, for a short time, run a cotton mill in a southern State, and he was originally appointed and sent abroad as an expert to report upon the cotton industries, apparently without the slightest thought that he would be called on to consider the wholly different and unfamiliar industry of wool manufacture.

After twenty-eight months spent abroad in investigating the cotton industry, Mr. Clark seems suddenly to have been instructed to make an inquiry into the wool manufacturing industry of Europe, and on this work, for which several years might well have been allowed to an experienced and competent authority, Mr. Clark appears to have spent just two months in gathering the information on which Senator LA FOLLETTE relies as the basis of his violent onslaught on the American wool manufacturing industry.

The grotesque inadequacy of a two months' inquiry by a special agent entirely unfamiliar with the subject aroused an immediate protest from American wool manufacturers. This association, through its tariff committee in February last, made formal remonstrance to the Committee on Ways and Means against the injustice to Mr. Clark, and the far more serious injustice to the wool manufacturing industry of America involved in the presentation of Mr. Clark's report and testimony, after only two months' inquiry abroad, as to the woolen industry, with which he was entirely unfamiliar, after having given twenty-eight months to the cotton industry, with which his short business career had been identified.

We would like to emphasize that this association did not in any way question the sincerity of Mr. Clark, or his personal zeal or intelligence. The point emphasized in the remonstrance was simply this—that it was so unfair as to be absolutely indefensible, to depute a man who had no knowledge of the wool manufacture in any practical way to make an investigation of this great industry in Europe, to give him only two months for this purpose, when two or three years ought to have been granted to competent authority, and then to cite the facts and figures thus hastily collected as a justification for striking down the protection given to the wool manufacturing industry of the United States.

Senator LA FOLLETTE has criticised the short time and the brief consideration granted to the present revision of the tariff, and he has laid stress upon the inadequacy of the preparation. But we venture to submit that nowhere is this alleged inadequacy so manifest and indefensible as in the work of the very witness whom the Senator from Wisconsin summons and eulogizes as a great authority in wool manufacture, though apparently Mr. Clark has never spent in the serious pursuit of this business a single hour of his life.

In our remonstrance against the inadequacy of Mr. Clark's equipment and information, and the very serious errors contained both in his report and in his testimony, the tariff committee of this association submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means a careful analysis and an answer to Mr. Clark's well-meant, but gravely misleading, assertions. In view of the conspicuous use made of these assertions by Senator LA FOLLETTE, we ask that, in the interests of truth and fair play to the wool manufacture of America, this remonstrance and analysis be submitted to the Senate and printed in the RECORD.

Sincerely, yours,

WINTHROP L. MARVIN, Secretary.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE REPORT ON THE "MANUFACTURE OF WOOLEN, WORSTED, AND SHODDY IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND, AND JUTE IN SCOTLAND," MADE TO THE BUREAU OF MANUFACTURES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR, BY MR. W. A. GRAHAM CLARK, SPECIAL AGENT OF THE DEPARTMENT, ON NOVEMBER 1, 1908; COVERING ALSO THE TESTIMONY OF MR. CLARK BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON DECEMBER 11 AND 22, 1908, SO FAR AS THEY RELATE TO THE MANUFACTURE OF WOOL IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

The object of this analysis is, if possible, to aid the Committee on Ways and Means in arriving at a clear determination of what there is that is new and of value as to comparative costs of manufacture in the wool-manufacturing industry in Great Britain and the United States in the report of Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, special agent of the Bureau of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, submitted on November 1, 1908, and in the testimony of Mr. Clark before the committee on December 11 and 22, 1908.

It is supposed that the Bureau of Manufactures was established primarily for the purpose of collecting information which might be of assistance to the manufacturing industries of this country. It is therefore natural to presume that information obtained with this object in view would be collected with such care and accuracy as to leave no question as to its absolute impartiality and reliability. It is because of this presumption in favor of the work of Mr. Clark as an expert, selected to collect such information for a government department, that much of interest and practical value to the wool-manufacturing industry of this country would be expected in his report. While it is true that much of the information reported by him is interesting from a general standpoint, it is nevertheless to be regretted that a careful reading of his report shows that his data as to comparative costs cover such a narrow field, contain so many inaccuracies, and are based so little on actual manufacturing experience as to raise a serious question as to its practical value.

We shall confine our attention to such errors as we deem of sufficient importance to call to the attention of the committee.

THE ENGLISH WOOLEN INDUSTRY.

There can be no question that the wool-manufacturing industry in England, which Mr. Clark was asked to investigate in two short months, is a matter of such intricacy and difficulty as to tax the knowledge and lifelong experience of the most skilled and best-informed manufacturers. Any doubt on this point must be dispelled by Mr. Clark's own description of the condition of that industry in England. He writes as follows:

"Employment in all branches of the wool industry is more or less irregular, for not only are there good and bad years, but the fluctuations of the demand for various kinds of wool manufactures sometimes throw a whole locality making some specialty into the depths of distress, and at the same time perhaps raise another to the heights of prosperity. This changing demand sometimes acts only between towns making various specialties and at others affects a whole country. When there is a great demand for very soft draping goods, France is prosperous and England can hardly keep her mills going, while, when the demand is for firmer worsteds and tailor-made goods, England will be prosperous and perhaps France losing ground. Sometimes woolen goods are in demand and then worsteds. One season the all-wool goods may bring in the most profit and another season, with high-priced wool, only the sections making mixed goods can show any profit at all. The wool industry is thus subject to many fluctuations, and in that sense is not a stable industry as are, for instance, certain branches of the cotton trade making staple cloths that are in demand year in and year out. In the wool trade there have to be new styles gotten out for the summer and winter, and the demand of the public for variety is growing all the time, so that the mills have to employ a larger number of men in their designing and sales departments, which adds to the cost."

The president of our association informed you as follows:

"There are very few, if any, woolen fabrics that can be considered staple fabrics. Such as might possibly be so regarded are not made exactly alike by either foreign or domestic manufacturers; nor are they made exactly alike by the same manufacturers for a continuous period. So-called 'staple fabrics' are nearly always undergoing changes of construction, in conformity with the varying quantities and character of raw-wool production and changing prices to meet the demands of buyers to produce garments at fixed prices. The variety of fabrics included under the classifications of Schedule K is so extensive that they can not be enumerated, much less compared."

"* * * In this connection it is necessary to consider the infinite variety of patterns, styles, colorings, and combinations embraced in this immense variety of fabrics, all of which are constantly changing under the capricious dictates of fashion."

COMMON BASIS OF FACT NECESSARY FOR COMPARISON OF COSTS.

There would also seem to be no question but that data as to comparative costs of manufacture in different countries, to be of practical value, must be collected in accordance with some common basis and standard of calculation. In the statement made before your committee by the president of our association, we gave you as a reason for not furnishing you with information relating to comparative costs of production of woolen goods in foreign countries and in the United States, that it is not obtainable, and we tried to show that a comparison of foreign and domestic costs is not practicable. We feel confident that a careful scrutiny of Mr. Clark's report and testimony fully bears out this contention.

At the very outset of any inquiry into comparative costs, we are, as our president stated to the committee, confronted with the fact that: "Every avenue of information regarding the foreign wool manufacture is jealously guarded from American inquiry by foreign manufacturers."

and by the fundamental questions:

"What is the cost of production and what is meant by the relative cost of production in different countries?"

It must also be clear, as stated by him, that:

"In order to determine the actual cost it will be found necessary to establish a given basis for calculations in order to make the comparisons of value."

We can not emphasize too strongly the great inherent difficulties in the way of the most highly qualified expert in obtaining trustworthy information as to foreign costs in this industry, not only because of its difficult and complex nature, and the natural jealousy with which English manufacturers guard their trade secrets and processes from our manufacturers and each other, but also because of the natural desire of such foreign manufacturers to have the protective tariff of this country broken down, in order to open our mar-

kets to their goods. For the latter reason, if for no other, any information as to foreign costs which any foreign manufacturer might seem willing to disclose should be subjected to the most careful scrutiny and analysis as to its sources, the possible selfish motive back of it, and the basis upon which such costs were determined.

COMMON STANDARD OF COMPARISON NECESSARY.

It is naturally a source of surprise that Mr. Clark, who was selected by the Bureau of Manufactures for this difficult task, should neither have had previous experience in the industry nor, so far as we know, sufficient, if any, knowledge as to costs of manufacture in this country to have made it possible for him to collect information abroad in accordance with any common fixed standard or basis for determining such costs.

Disclaiming any purpose to criticize Mr. Clark personally, we deem it necessary to point out that he was apparently sent abroad for entirely different purposes, and was, as an afterthought and without opportunity for preparation, given the task of investigating the wool industry in Great Britain and Europe upon completion of the special work for which he had been particularly sent abroad. The time allowed him, two months, was altogether inadequate. He testified as to the purpose of his trip abroad as follows:

"I have just returned from a twenty-eight months' trip, having been investigating the markets for cotton manufactures in Asia and the methods of cotton manufacturers in Europe, and for the last two months I have been working specially on getting information from the English wool mills in regard to their cost of manufacture for the use of this committee."

He also stated to the committee that he was called from Scotland while investigating the jute industry to take up the woolen business, and that he had been a practical cotton manufacturer for six years. His knowledge of the entire industry is apparently limited to that obtained by him by having—

"been through lots of woolen mills" while abroad "and studied the process," and "talked with the manufacturers."

His information as to the English industry is apparently limited to that obtained by visits to Bradford, Huddersfield, and, possibly, Leeds.

RELATIVE ADVANTAGES OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS OF ENGLAND OVER OUR MANUFACTURERS.

As we have before stated, some of the information given by Mr. Clark is interesting, and some in a general way true. We regard it as undoubtedly true, as he states, that English wool manufacturers have the following advantages over our wool manufacturers: (1) Cheaper first cost of machinery and building; (2) cheaper money; (3) cheaper raw material; (4) cheaper labor; (5) cheaper power; and (6) cheaper supplies. While we agree with Mr. Clark's general conclusions on this matter, he fails to furnish us with sufficient reliable data upon which to determine the relative advantages as to any of the particular items. This we shall now endeavor to show to the committee.

CHEAPER FIRST COST OF MACHINERY AND BUILDING IN ENGLAND.

On page 4490, first print No. 31, Mr. Clark states that our machinery and costs of building are at least one-fourth or 25 per cent higher than in England; while on page 4492 he states that English machinery is from one-third to one-half cheaper than ours, a difference of from 50 per cent to 100 per cent. Such a wide margin of variation can hardly be based on sufficiently accurate information to be of aid to the committee.

CHEAPER RAW MATERIAL IN ENGLAND.

As to wool as a raw material, Mr. Clark apparently has no first-hand information. He testified as to his knowledge of Rocky Mountain wools, which constitute the greater proportion of the wool raised in the United States, as follows:

"I have no actual knowledge excepting what is contained in the textile magazines and papers and what I have learned from talks with men in the business."

He states that—

"The different wools vary so in quality that a cost comparison between England and America is difficult to make. In London in 1907 fine greasy Australian crossbred wool averaged 30 cents a pound, and in Boston similar wool from Pennsylvania averaged 68 cents a pound, which gives some basis of comparison."

It is difficult to understand why wool worth 30 cents in London could not be landed in Boston at 30 cents a pound plus 11 cents duty and other expenses of importation, probably not over 1½ cents a pound. It would seem clear that Mr. Clark's knowledge in regard to wool is too indefinite to be of practical assistance.

But in spite of this fact he undertakes to make the general statement that the shrinkage of wools in general used by our manufacturers would not be two-thirds, but would run from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. This shrinkage is too small, and Mr. Clark's statement is erroneous. The actual facts in this matter, so far as an average can be struck, are covered by the information already given to the committee by our association.

LABOR CHEAPER IN ENGLAND BY ONE-HALF OR MORE.

While Mr. Clark's statement that labor is much cheaper in England is correct, he again furnishes no accurate data on which to base a comparison. Our president stated to you that on information received the night before he appeared before the committee, so far as he was able to judge—

"The wages in the worsted and woolen industry in Great Britain are about one-half, rather less than one-half, the wages paid in New England and Pennsylvania."

This cost, however, was limited to wages of operatives. On the subject of wages of wool industry in England, Mr. Clark says that—

"the industry is so complex and changeable that even if organized it would be difficult to secure any uniform scale of wages."

In his report to the Bureau of Manufactures he said:

"In the wool industry there is not only a great difference between the two branches of woolen manufacturing and worsted manufacturing, but in each case there is wide room for variations in methods and in number of machines employed."

"There is a great variety of materials employed and in the qualities and proportions of mixture of these materials, with consequent variation in production per machine; and as neither the employers nor the employees are strongly organized there is an absence of any universally accepted wage schedules."

As to the table of wages in the Bradford district given, Mr. Clark says:

"The foregoing wages may be taken as typical of the Bradford worsted industry, but there is more or less variation between the mills

in the town and in the country, and there is no uniformity even between two mills running side by side."

To the committee he stated as to women's dress goods and their manufacture in Bradford:

"I have not the complete wage cost throughout on that because the worsted industry is a very special industry."

It must be clear that in a matter of such difficulty and intricacy as the wages question, Mr. Clark on his own statements has furnished nothing of definite value as a basis for comparison.

CHEAPER COSTS IN ALL OTHER ITEMS.

According to Mr. Clark these other items of cost cover everything after the yarn and the weaving, and include dyes, chemicals and other supplies, charges on money, interest on capital, insurance, and depreciation. In one place in his testimony he gives these costs in England as 5 cents a yard, as against 4.2 cents in the United States, and in another place he gives these expenses both in England and the United States as 4.2 cents, apparently on the same fabric. He figures out this equality or advantage on the part of the United States, although he had previously stated to the committee that—

"* * * In general everything that enters into the cost of manufacture of woolen and worsted goods is cheaper in England than America."

Such discrepancies between conclusions, and what purport to be facts, indicate the danger of using any of his work as a basis for legislation. A few more specifications will confirm this.

HIGH COST OF CLOTHES NOT DUE TO HIGH WOOL, BUT TO TAILOR.

Mr. Clark stated to the committee:

"High clothes are due more to high wool than to high wages."

Unless the word "clothes" has been erroneously substituted for cloths, he is clearly in error. It must be clear that the difference between the cost of the cloth in the manufacturer's hands and the cost of the finished suit of clothes in the tailor's hands is due almost entirely to labor cost, and that even then the additional cost depends largely upon the name and charges of the particular tailor. It is also to be observed that the difference between the cost of a suit of clothes in New York, given by Mr. Clark as \$35, and the cost of a similar suit of clothes in Leeds, which he stated as from about \$20 to \$25, is not as great proportionately as the difference between the costs of manufacture in the two countries, as to which the English cost is given by Mr. Clark as about one-half or less.

Mr. Clark also stated that wool makes up 60 per cent of the cost of the goods. The general understanding among manufacturers is that the wool makes up 50 per cent of the cost of the cloth, and that the cloth represents about 50 per cent of the cost of a suit of clothes, in the wholesale clothing business. The result would be that the wool would represent only about 25 per cent of the cost of the clothes. A suit of clothes which costs about \$13 would ordinarily be sold at retail for about \$22. Furthermore, the question is complicated by the varying profits and selling expense connected with each stage of manufacture. The fact is that the proportion of wool in the cloth varies so, because of the immense and constantly changing variety of fabrics in which it is used, that it is impossible to strike an average, and the question of such proportion is a matter solely of individual opinion. The lack of specific data furnished by Mr. Clark confirms this fact. It must also be noted that he ignores entirely in his calculation what a large part labor represents in the cost of the wool.

INACCURATE COMPARISON OF CONSUMPTION OF WOOL IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Clark's statement and table as to materials used in the wool industry in Great Britain and the United States contains two important errors.

The table is as follows:

	United States Government product census, 1905.		English estimates, 1907.	
	Value.	Per cent.	Value.	Per cent.
Wool and hair.....	\$648,881,691	65	\$640,300,000	63
Shoddy.....	191,261,998	19	210,000,000	22
Cotton.....	102,743,256	10	125,000,000	12
Others (silk lining, jute, etc.).....	58,446,835	6	60,000,000	6
Total.....	1,001,333,775		1,035,300,000	

The columns headed "Value" should clearly represent pounds of weight. The figures as to the United States are taken from the census of 1905. An analysis of these figures will show that Mr. Clark has included twice in his table 70,801,994 pounds of shoddy and 5,720,319 pounds of cotton, which were produced from materials purchased otherwise reported, or from waste and clippings arising in the process of manufacture already once reported.

INACCURATE USE OF STATISTICS AS TO WOOL CONSUMPTION.

Mr. Clark states that:

"The per capita consumption of wool is increasing in the United Kingdom, and is not increasing in the United States."

In support of his contention that the consumption of raw wool in the United States is not increasing, he gives a table taken from the Statistical Abstract (U. S., 1907). In using this table Mr. Clark does not take into consideration the fact that while the United States exports a very small quantity of wool manufactures, it imports a considerable quantity of such manufactures, as indicated by a table in the statement made by our president before the committee, showing an increase of imports of manufactures of wool entered for consumption under the present tariff during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1898 to 1907, or from \$13,500,241 to \$22,357,206 foreign values, or from \$24,150,565 to \$42,349,232 duty-paid values. These imports of manufactures must clearly be included in any determination of the per capita consumption of wool in the United States.

The following is a table compiled from the census reports of 1890, 1900, and 1905 showing the quantity of "new wool in condition purchased" (i. e., greasy or scoured), exclusive of alpaca, angora, camel, and all other hairs, used in the United States wool manufacture, includ-

ing hosiery, knit goods, and shoddy, with the population of the United States and per capita consumption as shown by the wool used:

	New wool "in condi- tion pur- chased."	Popula- tion.	Per capita consump- tion in mills.
	Pounds.		Pounds.
1890.....	374,102,813	62,662,250	5.97
1900.....	412,745,779	76,303,887	5.41
1905.....	501,424,203	83,143,000	6.03

These figures, of course, show a smaller per capita consumption than Mr. Clark's, because they cover only new wool, while the figures used by him included other items. He obtained his figures as to the United Kingdom from the table of the Bradford Chamber of Commerce Report for 1907, which purports to show the total quantity of wool retained in the United Kingdom and not the quantity consumed. Part of the wool retained might afterwards be exported either in a raw or manuf-actured condition. An examination of this table will further show that there is included in the wool 210,000,000 pounds of shoddy. Furthermore, in using this table as a basis for comparison of relative consumption of wool, it must be borne in mind that while the United States exports a very small quantity of wool manufactures, Great Britain exports, on Mr. Clark's figures, about 40 per cent of its entire production, amounting to \$185,600,000 in 1907.

OUR IMPORTS OF WOOL MANUFACTURES—PERCENTAGE.

He states that our imports of wool goods are less than 5 per cent of our requirements. He figures on the foreign value of the goods, rather than on the basis of the foreign value plus duty, which would indicate the amount to which such goods displace domestic goods, and would, therefore, seem to be the proper basis to be used in considering the effect of a tariff. On this basis the percentage of imports would be slightly less than 10 per cent, and Mr. Clark's own figures show a little more than 5 per cent, instead of a little less than 5 per cent, as he states.

He makes the unsupported statement that cotton goods are sold in this country as wool goods. This is not true in so far as the manuf-acturers are concerned, and Mr. Clark must have been misinformed.

DUTY ON YARN NOT HIGHER THAN DUTY ON CLOTH—PERCENTAGES FALLACIOUS.

In referring to a piece of finished English cloth and its constituent elements, Mr. Clark states that the duty on the yarn in this cloth is higher than the duty on the cloth itself, and that the duty on the tops is much higher than the duty on the scoured wool. This statement as to the duties on the yarn and cloth is incorrect and misleading. It gives a striking illustration of the fallacies which may result from using percentages, and corroborates the statement made by our president on cross-examination at the time he made our original statement.

Assuming the percentages as stated by Mr. Clark to be correct, the actual duty would be as follows:

	Cents per pound.
On scoured wool.....	33.00
On tops.....	70.27
On warp yarn.....	65.23
On weft yarn.....	62.34
On cloth.....	96.23

That is, Mr. Clark is wrong in saying that the duty on the yarn is higher than the duty on the cloth. It is well known that the increased duty on tops, as compared with the duty on yarns, was intended to prevent the importation of wool in that form.

COMPARISON OF MEN'S AND WOMEN'S WAGES SHOULD NOT BE WITH EACH OTHER.

The comparison made between the weavers' wage, based on the average in Huddersfield and Bradford, and what Mr. Clark calls the average of \$9 in this country emphasizes the insufficiency of the information obtained by Mr. Clark as a basis for comparison of costs. To make a comparison, the weavers' wage in Huddersfield of \$6 a week for work on wide men's wear looms, and probably confined to men as weavers, should be compared with the weavers in this country on similar fabrics, where it is almost universally a man's job and where the earnings are more likely to be from \$14 to \$18 than as low as \$9. On the other hand, \$9 to \$12, which might be called the wage on dress goods in this country, as he states, might properly be comparable with \$3.75 in Bradford.

MANY OTHER INACCURACIES.

The following inaccuracies appear in Mr. Clark's testimony at his second appearance before the committee:

In figuring the cost of "Sample A," the report repeatedly states the cost in terms of pounds, when it should be the cost in a yard of cloth.

He states that ordinarily there would not be more than 66 per cent of wool in the filling on a pure cotton warp. As a matter of fact, the wool filling is frequently 70 per cent or more.

He states that a rag machine will tear rags into their "original fiber." It is not possible to obtain the original fiber at anywhere near its original length.

He states that shoddy can not be used by itself. As a matter of fact, it is used alone in some fabrics.

He states that there is a larger percentage of shoddy and cotton being used in the woolen manufactures of this country every year. This is a matter which varies much according to style.

He states that a suit of clothes at \$25 in this country would not probably be altogether new wool. As a matter of fact, navy and black summer serge suits, which contain no shoddy, sell for about \$15 and sometimes for less.

We hand to the committee herewith two all-wool suits, one purchased at retail in New York City for \$20 and the other purchased in Boston for \$25.

ACCURATE INFORMATION AS TO COMPARATIVE COSTS IMPORTANT.

We have left until the last the most important field which Mr. Clark has undertaken to cover, to wit, comparative costs of manufacture in Great Britain and the United States.

The only specific information given us by Mr. Clark as to comparative costs of fabrics in the two countries is limited to four fabrics,

samples A, B, C, and D on pages 86 to 88 of his report. In addition, Mr. Clark has also undertaken to give the theoretical cost in a theoretical mill of a plain worsted coating, figure 4, on page 69 of the report. The only other information as to specific fabrics obtained by him is as to 14 other samples of English cloth, as to which he has only the costs of such fabrics in England. Mr. Clark's information as to costs in America was apparently obtained after his return to this country at the suggestion of an English manufacturer, who informed him that there was a mill in this country manufacturing a fabric similar to that which the Englishman was making. Rather than take up the time of the committee further than is absolutely necessary, we shall confine our analysis of Mr. Clark's work on the subject of comparison of costs to a consideration of the data furnished by him as to samples A, B, C, and D, and as to the theoretical fabric made in the theoretical mill and represented by figure 4, on page 69 of his report.

COMPARISON OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN COSTS.

As representing the immense dress-goods industry of England we have only these four samples, A, B, C, and D, obtained from the city of Bradford. Samples A and B are cotton-warp fabrics with worsted filling. Sample C is an all-wool saaten, and sample D an all-wool serge. The city of Bradford plays an important part in the dress-goods industry only as to the manufacture of so-called "Bradford stuffs," of which Mr. Clark has only furnished two samples, A and B, out of an infinite variety.

SAMPLES A AND B.

For practical purposes the information obtained as to samples A and B is almost valueless at the outset, because they represent a fabric known to the trade as "cotton-warp cashmeres," which were formerly made in large quantities in this country, but are now out of fashion and nearly obsolete, having become so because of their poor intrinsic worth.

The information as to these samples is of still less value because of lack of sufficient detail to permit a fair comparison with American costs, and because of the numerous inaccuracies and discrepancies in the figures given, and the deductions drawn therefrom by Mr. Clark. He has not given us the separate costs for the cotton-warp and worsted-weft yarns. He states that the British manufacturer bought his yarns. The cost of the yarn must, therefore, include profits of manufacture and sale up to the point of weaving. The cost given by Mr. Clark must also include profits on the different processes of manufacture subsequent to the weaving, owing to the division and specialization of the different processes which Mr. Clark tells us exist in England, where, as a general rule, each manufacturer only carries out one process in the manufacture. In the United States, on the contrary, the processes are not so much subdivided, and it is not unusual for the same manufacturer to carry on all processes from the raw wool to the finished cloth. The costs obtained by Mr. Clark on the four domestic samples would appear to have been figured on this basis rather than on the English basis; that is, on a radically different basis.

It is to be noted that the details of construction of the English samples given by Mr. Clark are apparently based on tests made by the conditioning house of Bradford, England. The object of these tests is apparently not to determine the structure of the cloth in the gray state—that is, as it leaves the loom—but to determine whether finished goods sold by sample come up to the sample. The original analyses by this Bradford conditioning house of the samples obtained by Mr. Clark are in the possession of the Bureau of Manufactures. These analyses show the counts or sizes of the cotton warp and worsted weft yarn, together with the average twists in the yarns, only as they appear in the finished fabric. The weight of the original cloth in the gray is not given. The strength and elasticity of the cloth are given, warp way and weft way. A chemical test is also given, showing the proportion of the cotton and wool in the piece, calculated from the clean and dry weight of the cloth. While such analyses may be commercially valuable as determining the question, as before stated, of whether a cloth delivered is in accordance with sample, in cases of dispute, they are intrinsically of little value as a basis for comparison in considering the manufacture of other fabrics. The different processes of finishing cloth after the weaving produce effects of such marked difference in the finished fabric, as compared with the cloth in the gray, as to render the results of such analyses uncertain and of doubtful value.

SAMPLE A.—COTTON WARP PIECE-DYED CASHMERE WITH LOW BOTANY WOOL FILLING.

The inaccuracies and discrepancies between Mr. Clark's records of the construction and weights of this fabric, and the weights and construction as we find them to be from the actual sample obtained by Mr. Clark, are so numerous as to make it impossible to use his data as a basis for comparison with American fabrics. The following is a comparative analysis of sample A:

	Mr. Clark's records.	American analysis.
	Ounces.	Ounces.
Total weight finished.....	3.22	2.91
Weight of warp.....	1.25	1.16
Weight of weft.....	1.94	1.75

It is true that these variations can be accounted for partially by different atmospheric conditions in the two countries, but we do not think that this would account for more than one-half of the variation.

Assuming this cloth to have been made from yarns purchased in the United States, under conditions existing on the 29th day of January, 1909, the cost to the mill would be as follows:

4.81 pounds of combed yarn.....	\$2.45
.12 pounds of combed yarn for selvage.....	.09
7.8 pounds fine Botany worsted.....	11.32
Total materials.....	13.86
Cost of weaving.....	4.23
Cost of dyeing, finishing, packing, and delivering.....	2.30
Selling cards.....	.12
Plant charges.....	1.11
Interest charges from purchase of yarn to payment for goods.....	.82
Total.....	22.44

This cost is for a piece containing 65 yards finished, and would represent a cost per yard of 34.5 cents, exclusive of selling expenses.

If a weaving plant were fitted up exclusively to make this particular fabric or absolutely similar fabrics in large quantities, the cost might possibly be reduced 2½ cents per yard by securing the yarns at lower prices, and manufacturing at a reduced cost resulting therefrom. This might reduce the cost to 32 cents per yard. The foreign cost, as given by Mr. Clark, is 15.6 cents per yard; that is, the American cost under the most favorable conditions, and not including selling expenses, would be 105.1 per cent greater than the foreign cost, whereas Mr. Clark states it to be 67 per cent.

Mr. Clark gives the weft ends per inch in this cloth as 72, although the weight and structure of the finished cloth would necessitate about 92 weft ends.

The cost of these goods 42 inches wide is given by Mr. Clark as 15.6 cents per linear yard. In figuring the cost per square yard, the basis on which the duty is fixed, Mr. Clark figures a cost of 14.7 cents, as quoted in his testimony before the committee, although it is perfectly clear from his own figures that the cost per square yard would be 13.371 cents.

The filling in this cloth is described as low Botany wool, spun to the size or count of 66. We are positive that this wool could not have been what is commercially known as low Botany wool, and must have been fine Botany wool, because low Botany wool taken alone can not be spun to as fine a count as 66 for commercial purposes. The differences in the relative weights of materials in sample A, and the so-called similar cloth used for a basis of comparison in this country, would seem to indicate that the fabrics must have been different. These weights are as follows:

	Sample A.	American cloth.
	Ounces.	Ounces.
Weight per yard.....	3.22	3.36
Weight of warp.....	1.28 (39.8 per cent)	1.46 (43.5 per cent)
Weight of weft.....	1.94 (60.2 per cent)	1.9 (56.5 per cent)

These inaccuracies and this lack of similarity in data indicate the inherent danger in making comparisons of costs except upon accurate and fixed bases of calculation.

SAMPLE B.—CASHMERE MADE OF COTTON AND BOTANY WORSTED, CROSS DYED.

In this sample again it is clear, from the quantities and weights of materials and structure of fabric given by Mr. Clark, that yarn of the sizes described by him would produce a fabric lighter than finished weight given.

This sample purports to be made of 1/50's cotton warp. On the weight given it would seem to be clear that the yarn must have been as heavy as 40's. It can not be true that the warp in this case is 50's as compared with sample A, purporting to have the same size of warp, because in sample B there are 68 less ends given in the warp, and yet the weight of warp is given as 25 per cent greater per yard than in sample A.

The weft yarn in sample B is given as size 66, while its weight would correspond to the weight of 60's. This difference might be accounted for by the use of glue to stiffen the goods, which would at the same time add to the weight. We find no mention of any extraneous substance in Mr. Clark's figures, and yet the weight of materials is of most vital consideration in determining costs of goods.

In both samples A and B, as to foreign cost we are given the supposed construction, yarn cost, weaving wage, expenses, and dyeing cost. It is most unusual and hardly credible that a Bradford mill did its own dyeing. It is most unusual and hardly credible that a British mill sold its goods in a finished condition, as the custom in that country is to divide and specialize the processes of weaving and dyeing and finishing.

An analysis of this cloth shows the following variations:

	Mr. Clark's records.	American analysis.
Ends of warp.....	71	75½
Weft ends per inch.....	93	96½
Weight of cloth, ounces.....	3.86	3.71
Weight of warp, ounces.....	1.6	1.65
Weight of weft, ounces.....	2.26	2.06

These variations are too great to be accounted for purely by atmospheric conditions. The estimated American cost of sample B would be as follows:

Cotton warp yarn, per cut.....	\$2.75
Worsted weft yarn.....	13.33
Weaving.....	5.37
Dyeing, finishing, packing, and delivering.....	2.96
Selling cards.....	15
Plant charges.....	1.41
Interest charges until goods are paid for.....	.98

Total at mill..... 26.95

This would be the cost of a piece containing 67 yards, representing a cost per yard of 40.2 cents, exclusive of selling expenses.

It is also possible in this case that a weaving plant fitted up especially to make these goods in large quantity might, by purchasing materials at lower prices, and with the reduced cost resulting from purchases and manufacture in quantity, make a saving of 3 cents per yard, leaving a cost of 37.2 cents. The foreign cost is given as 17.85 cents; that is, the American cost under the most advantageous circumstances, and not including selling expenses, would be 108.4 per cent greater, whereas Mr. Clark states it to be 67 per cent greater.

It is to be noted that this piece was cross-dyed; that is, the warp was dyed before weaving and the cloth dyed after being woven, although this is not noted in Mr. Clark's report. In this sample, as in sample A, Mr. Clark apparently derives his construction from the finished cloth. It is to be noted that, according to the Bradford Conditioning House test, the count of the cotton warp is 36.4 and of the

worsted weft 62.7, although Mr. Clark's statement gives the cotton warp as 50's and the worsted weft as 66's.

The chemical test made to determine the relative quantities of cotton and wool in the fabric is not objectionable for determining the variations between two pieces of cloth purporting to be the same, but it is misleading as to the proportion of cotton and wool in any given piece of cloth under natural atmospheric conditions, because under natural conditions there is a large amount of moisture in the cloth. It is to be observed that in the test the materials have been reduced to a clean and dry weight. As, however, the natural moisture in the cotton is only about one-half that in the wool, and the quantity of the wool is greater in proportion, under natural conditions the percentages would be materially changed. This merely shows how inadequately Mr. Clark has indicated the intricate and puzzling conditions which arise in determining costs of manufacture.

SAMPLE C.—ALL-WOOL SATEEN.

A comparison of Mr. Clark's figures and our American analysis is as follows:

	Mr. Clark's records.	American analysis.
Warp ends.....	110	112½
Picks of filling.....	53	54
Total weight of weft per yard, ounces.....	7.07	6.79
Total weight of worsted warp, ounces.....	4.7	4.4
Total weight of filling, ounces.....	2.37	2.39
(These analyses agree as well as could be expected.)		
Ends of worsted warp.....	62	62
Number of worsted weft.....	30	28

	American estimate of cost.
Worsted yarn.....	\$48.54
Weaving.....	4.74
Dyeing, finishing, packing, and delivering.....	5.04
Selling cards.....	.34
Plant charges.....	.89
Interest charges.....	2.35

Total..... 61.90

This is the cost on a piece of 84 yards, representing a cost per yard of 76.4 cents, exclusive of selling expenses. If the mill were fitted up especially to make these goods and nothing else, these costs could be somewhat reduced, possibly by about 4 cents per yard, making a cost of 72.4 cents. The foreign cost is given as 31.12 cents. The American cost would be, therefore, 132.6 per cent greater. This agrees very well with the American cost quoted by Mr. Clark.

Sample D—All-wool serge made of crossbred wool.

	Mr. Clark's records.	American analysis.
Ends of warp.....	53	54½
Picks of filling.....	42	42½
Total weight..... ounces.....	6.16	5.81
Weight of warp..... do.....	3.42	3.05
Weight of weft..... do.....	2.74	2.76

The variations in the total weight, about 5 per cent, might possibly be accounted for by differences in atmospheric conditions. This is a fabric of very peculiar character which must have been subject to unusual shrinkage from the gray yarn to the finished cloth, over and above the usual loss in finishing this class of goods, the unusual shrinkage being produced by the singeing and scouring processes.

American cost of yarn.....	\$36.98
Weaving.....	3.83
Dyeing, finishing, packing, and delivering.....	5.23
Selling cards.....	.28
Plant charges.....	.82
Interest charges.....	1.85

Total..... 48.99

This would be the cost on a piece of 91 yards, representing a cost per yard of 42½ cents, exclusive of selling expenses.

If this cloth could be made at all in this country under our climatic conditions, and if a mill were especially fitted up to do it, the cost could probably be reduced 2½ cents per yard, but we regard it as a cloth that it would not be practicable to make in the United States.

A THEORETICAL FABRIC MADE IN A THEORETICAL MILL.

We will now consider Mr. Clark's figures as to the cost of the worsted coating represented by figure 4, on page 69, of his report.

All of the data relating to the manufacture of this cloth appears to be purely theoretical, and derived from a great many sources. None of it purports to have been obtained from actual results of any one manufacturer. The whole structure is evidently built up in this way:

A. An imaginary machinery equipment for 100 wide looms is assumed. This does not include power plant or buildings, the cost of power and rent being determined on some hypothetical basis, as to which the detail is not stated.

B. Then a fabric is imagined, namely, a 60-inch wide worsted coating, made according to a certain formula, of which a sample of cloth put in evidence purports to be the finished result.

C. Then the practically impossible assumption is made that on this fabric 100 looms could be run for one year (fifty weeks) continuously without interruption and with a yield of 70 per cent of their theoretically maximum product; in other words, that a maximum daily product could be secured continuously throughout a whole year.

D. By calculation it is then determined how many pounds of worsted yarn of a certain kind and quality would be required to keep this weaving mill in operation during the year. This amount is fixed at 512,000 pounds.

E. Then theoretical calculations are entered into to determine the cost of this yarn to the weaver, basing the whole amount, a year's

product of 512,000 pounds, upon a fixed price, namely, 11½d. for Port Phillip greasy wool. As the present price of Port Phillip wool of the kind described is, within about two months of the date of Mr. Clark's report, 14½d. in London, an advance of about 30 per cent over the price named by Mr. Clark, it would hardly seem safe to establish such a mill on the assumption of a fixed price of wool for a whole year, particularly in a business so variable and subject to changes of fashion, as Mr. Clark describes this business to be.

F.—It is assumed that every yard of these goods will be perfect; that there will be no seconds; that the number of pounds of worsted yarn estimated will produce 8,000 pieces 61½ yards each, each yard being 37 inches long; and that the goods will weigh when finished 16.15 ounces to the lineal yard.

These are all theoretical calculations, so far as appears, none of the alleged facts having been taken from the books of manufacturing concerns. It must be clear that this method of arriving at the cost of an article can not fairly be regarded as a correct basis on which to establish a business, and that the results hoped for can not be depended upon.

Furthermore, it would seem as if Mr. Clark had left out in his calculations certain necessary elements of cost under the English system of carrying on the wool-manufacturing business. For example, he bases his calculations upon a price of wool fixed at 11½d. per pound for a whole year's supply. It is evident that some one must have to stand the expense of carrying this wool from the time the contract of purchase is made until the wool is all manufactured, which might extend several months beyond the time of the last delivery of the wool, and yet Mr. Clark only includes such expense for a period of three months. It would also appear that Mr. Clark has omitted the selling charges and profits of the merchants who take part in the intermediate transactions in the course of manufacture in England, and has only considered the commissions paid by those merchants for work done on their wool and tops by other persons, for instance, the wool comb and spinner.

Furthermore, it is a physical impossibility to produce 496,640 pounds of finished cloth from 512,000 pounds of worsted yarn. This result would show a waste between the worsted yarn and the finished cloth of only 3 per cent. This should be at least 10 per cent. The following calculation will show the amount of cloth ordinarily obtainable from 100 pounds of yarn.

According to the trade terms quoted by Mr. Clark, the yarn is sold in England on the basis of containing 18½ per cent of moisture—that is, in each 100 pounds of yarn there would be 84.56 pounds of yarn in a bone-dry condition. According to the trade terms in England, cloth in a standard condition contains 16 per cent of moisture; 16 per cent of 84.56 pounds is equivalent to 13.53 pounds, which, added to 84.56 pounds, would give 98.09 pounds of cloth. From this, however, there must be deducted the amount of oil and other foreign substances in the yarn, which would be not less than 5 per cent of its original weight, i. e., 5 pounds. Deducting this from 98.09 pounds, we have 93.09 pounds of cloth under normal conditions. This shows a shrinkage of about 7 per cent from the original 100 pounds of yarn. From this there must be deducted also the amount of absolutely necessary waste made in the preparation of the warp and in the manufacture of the cloth, which surely could not be less than 3 per cent, or 3 pounds. Deducting this from 93.09 pounds, we have practically 90 pounds of finished cloth from 100 pounds of worsted yarn, or a shrinkage of 10 per cent, instead of 97 pounds and a 3 per cent shrinkage, as estimated by Mr. Clark. In actual practice in the United States, in the manufacture of goods of this class it is not expected to get over 16 ounces of finished cloth from 18 ounces of worsted yarn, and the percentage of loss varies from 10 per cent to a much higher percentage, according to the nature of the cloth and conditions of manufacture.

Furthermore, the testimony of leading manufacturers who have been consulted in regard to this matter is unanimous that, from the formula laid down by Mr. Clark on page 69 of his report, it would not be possible to manufacture this cloth, either in the weight stated to be required or the width; in other words, that the formula given by Mr. Clark would not produce the cloth that is alleged to have been produced from that formula. Following is a letter from one of our leading manufacturers demonstrating this fact:

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We have studied over the particulars of the plain worsted coating which you sent us very carefully, and we do not think it is possible to make this cloth to finish 60 inches wide and weigh 16.15 ounces with particulars given. The way we would make this cloth from the size of yarn given to finish 60 inches wide and to weigh finished 16 ounces would be as follows: Seventy-two ends of 2/44's worsted warp per inch, 72 picks of 1/20's worsted filling per inch, goods to be laid 78 inches wide in loom, to finish 60 inches wide. It would take 72 yards of warp to produce 61½ yards of finished cloth, and each piece would require 34½ pounds of warp and 35½ pounds of filling.

Yours, very truly,

DUNN WORSTED MILLS,
E. S. DUNN, Treasurer.

This being the case, of what value can Mr. Clark's calculations be? Instead of taking 64 pounds of worsted yarn to make 62.08 pounds of finished cloth, as Mr. Clark states, it would take at least 68.9 pounds, according to Mr. Dunn, and this is the opinion of American manufacturers who have been consulted.

A careful checking of the figures given by Mr. Clark on pages 69-79 of his report will show many inaccuracies. We shall not endeavor to point them out in detail. As indicating the danger of using Mr. Clark's work we wish, however, to call attention to one important fact. On page 70 of his report he estimates a return of 46 pounds of tops from 100 pounds of wool. In testifying to the committee he stated that there would be a return of 40 pounds of tops out of 100 pounds of wool, shrinkage 50 per cent. A difference of 6 pounds in the amount of tops, at 48.6 cents per pound, would obviously make a great difference in the cost of cloth.

DOUBLE COST REQUIRES TWICE THE PROFITS TO PAY THE SAME PERCENTAGE. If it be true that in the United States the cost of plant, equipment, and manufacture is double that in England, it is obvious that, in order that the manufacturer in this country may be compensated at the same rate as the foreign manufacturer, his aggregate profits must be double in amount those of the foreign manufacturer.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, we submit that Mr. Clark has not furnished to the committee, nor did he have for use in his investigation, what is absolutely essential to a comparative study of costs, to wit, a common fixed

basis for collecting data relating to such costs. And we say that facts as to costs obtained in accordance with the varying conceptions of individual manufacturers can not safely be compared.

He has obtained only 18 samples of the fabrics of an industry in which the variety is infinite and which, he says, are controlled by the "vagaries of fashion," and which our president informed you were subject to the "capricious dictates of fashion." For purposes of comparison he has taken the trouble to obtain from one wool-manufacturing establishment, out of over 1,200 in this country, the costs of 4 samples supposed to be similar to 4 of the English samples which he obtained. Two of the 4 fabrics are going out of fashion and nearly obsolete. This is all the basis which we have for comparison of costs of fabrics, and the details of these costs were not obtained on a known or common basis, nor have we any means of testing their truth or accuracy. Furthermore, though Mr. Clark is undoubtedly a clever student and a truthful young man, his lack of knowledge of the business would not enable him to test information imparted to him in such manner as to confirm in any degree its accuracy.

We wish to register our protest against the unfairness done to Mr. Clark in giving him the task of investigating such a complex and difficult industry upon such inadequate notice.

We wish further to register our protest against the unfairness to our industry resulting from the selection for such an important matter of a man unfamiliar with the industry either in this country or abroad. The most expert manufacturer could not hope to obtain a clear insight into such an industry in two months. It is not reassuring as to the value of government expert work that an executive department should, for the purpose of aiding the Committee on Ways and Means in their work of revising the tariff, conduct in such a perfunctory manner an investigation into the costs of an industry which, according to the census report of 1905, employed in this country 185,592 persons, used a capital of \$370,861,691, used materials of a cost of \$242,561,096 and produced a finished product of \$380,934,003. A private manufacturer who undertook to carry on his own business on a knowledge of costs thus obtained would meet nothing but bankruptcy.

It is furthermore to be regretted that in spite of the short and inadequate investigation of comparative costs that Mr. Clark was allowed to make, and in spite of the uncertain nature of the data which he has reported, he should have had in mind, while carrying on an impartial investigation of comparative costs, the question of the effect of the duties placed on the cloth by this country as indicated by the table on page 86 of his report. Nothing could be more misleading than this table unless Mr. Clark's data as to American costs was accurate and fairly representative of the costs in the entire industry. We feel that there can be no question that they are neither representative nor of practical value as a basis for comparison.

It is our opinion that the discrepancies between the details of construction and English costs of samples A, B, C, and D as given by Mr. Clark, and the results shown by analyses made in this country, are so marked as to raise a grave doubt as to whether the American manufacturer who furnished the American costs to Mr. Clark did not act under a misapprehension as to the problem submitted to him, and whether he was correctly informed of the basis of calculation of the English costs or the purpose for which the information was to be used. And we feel convinced that the results of Mr. Clark's work fully confirm the opinion expressed to the committee by our president, that reliable information as to foreign costs of manufacture is not obtainable.

Very truly, yours,

William Whitman, Boston, President and Chairman ex officio; Frederic S. Clark, North Billerica, Mass.; Charles H. Harding, Philadelphia, Pa.; Louis B. Goodall, Sanford, Me.; Joseph R. Grundy, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Hopewell, Boston, Mass.; John P. Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. R. MacColl, Pawtucket, R. I.; Francis T. Maxwell, Rockville, Conn.; J. E. Maynard, Utica, N. Y.; Thomas Oakes, Bloomfield, N. J., Tariff Committee National Association of Wool Manufacturers; Winthrop L. Marvin, Secretary.

SUMMARY OF THE STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS IN RELATION TO THE REPORT OF W. A. GRAHAM CLARK TO THE BUREAU OF MANUFACTURES ON NOVEMBER 1, 1908, AND HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON DECEMBER 11 AND 22, 1908.

P. 152. The purpose of this statement is to aid the committee in determining what new and valuable information Mr. Clark obtained.

P. 152. The Bureau of Manufactures is supposed to have been established to aid our industries; therefore the work of its agents should be impartial and reliable. Mr. Clark's report, however, although interesting, covers too limited a field, is too full of inaccuracies, and based too little on manufacturing experience to be of practical value.

P. 153. Mr. Clark's and Mr. Whitman's description of the unstable and complex nature of the industry agree.

P. 154. Common basis of fact necessary for comparison of costs.

P. 155. Mr. Clark's report and testimony bear out the contention of our association before the committee that information as to comparative costs of production in foreign countries and the United States is not obtainable, and a comparison of foreign and domestic costs is not practicable, for the following reasons:

"Foreigners guard trade secrets jealously.
"There is no common or definite understanding of what is meant by cost of production.

"A certain basis of calculation is necessary to make comparisons.
"The most highly qualified expert would find it a difficult matter to obtain reliable data.

"Foreign manufacturers have a selfish interest in breaking down our tariff, and information given by them should be carefully scrutinized."

COMMON STANDARD OF COMPARISON NECESSARY.

P. 155. Mr. Clark had had no practical experience in the industry or knowledge of it on which to base his study of comparative costs. He was apparently sent abroad for other purposes, and the two months given him were too short.

RELATIVE ADVANTAGES OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS OF ENGLAND OVER OUR MANUFACTURERS.

Paragraph 156. Some of Mr. Clark's information is in a general way interesting and true, yet his data is too indefinite to be of practical value in the following among other very important particulars.

CHEAPER FIRST COST OF MACHINERY AND BUILDING IN ENGLAND.

Paragraph 156. He states that machinery and building are one-half to one-third cheaper in England, making ours cost from 50 per cent to 100 per cent more.

CHEAPER RAW MATERIAL IN ENGLAND.

Paragraph 157. He states that he had no first-hand knowledge of wool, and yet makes the erroneous statement that the average shrinkage of wool used in this country is 50 per cent to 60 per cent.

LABOR CHEAPER IN ENGLAND BY ONE-HALF OR MORE.

Paragraph 157. He found no uniform scale of wages in England, giving as reasons the complexity and changeableness of the industry and lack of labor organization. Our president stated to the committee that in so far as he was able to judge, English wages were one-half or less than one-half of wages in New England and Pennsylvania.

CHEAPER COSTS IN ALL OTHER ITEMS.

Paragraph 159. Costs of sample A, subsequent to weaving, are stated to be equal in both countries, which is inconsistent with Mr. Clark's general conclusion that all costs in England are less.

HIGH COST OF CLOTHES NOT DUE TO HIGH WOOL BUT TO TAILOR.

Paragraph 159. Mr. Clark undertakes to fix the proportion of the value of the wool to the value of a suit of clothes as 60 per cent. He ignores the labor cost in production of the wool. The general understanding among wholesale clothing manufacturers is that the wool represents about 25 per cent, although the infinite variety of fabrics makes such an average a matter of individual opinion. A suit costing \$13 will ordinarily sell at retail for \$22.

INACCURATE COMPARISON OF CONSUMPTION OF WOOL IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Paragraph 160. Mr. Clark's table states values instead of weight of materials used in the wool industry. He includes certain items twice and ignores the imports and exports. He does not distinguish between wool retained which may be manufactured and exported and wool for consumption.

Paragraph 161. He uses foreign values, instead of duty-paid values, in estimating the relation between our imports and our total wool consumption.

Paragraph 162. The duties from the wool to the cloth are given to disprove the statement that the duty on the yarn is higher than on the cloth. Percentages are shown to be fallacious.

Paragraph 163. The increased duty on tops is stated to be to prevent importation in that form.

Paragraph 163. Mr. Clark is shown to be in error in comparing men's with women's wages.

Paragraph 164. Many other inaccuracies.—Two all-wool suits are introduced as exhibits; New York retail price \$20, Boston retail price \$25, to disprove statement that an all-wool suit can not be bought in this country for \$25.

ACCURATE INFORMATION AS TO COMPARATIVE COSTS IMPORTANT.

Paragraph 164. Mr. Clark's information as to comparative costs is limited to four samples. His only additional information as to special fabrics is limited to 14 samples as to which he obtained English and not American costs, and a theoretical fabric made in a theoretical mill.

Paragraph 165. Samples A and B.—These are cotton-warp dress goods which are nearly obsolete. The details of construction are insufficient and inaccurate, and the costs are apparently figured on a radically different basis because of the different division of manufacture in England and in this country. Details of construction are apparently based on analyses of the finished fabric.

Paragraph 167. Sample A. Cotton-warp piece-dyed cashmere with low botany-wool filling.—Inaccuracies and discrepancies make comparison impossible, partly, but not wholly, accounted for by different atmospheric conditions.

Paragraph 168. American analyses and comparison of costs give American cost 105.1 per cent greater, instead of 67 per cent. Selling expenses not included.

Sample B. Cashmere made of cotton and botany worsted cross dyed.—Inaccuracies and discrepancies make comparison impossible; not accounted for by different atmospheric conditions.

Paragraph 169. American analyses and comparison give American cost 108.4 per cent greater, instead of 67 per cent. Selling expenses not included.

Paragraph 171. Sample C. All wool sateen.—American analyses and comparison give American cost 132.6 per cent greater, exclusive of selling expenses. This compares very well with the American cost quoted by Mr. Clark.

Paragraph 172. Sample D. All wool serge made of crossbred wool.—American analyses and cost given, exclusive of selling expenses. This cloth it would not be practicable to make in the United States.

Paragraph 172. Theoretical fabric made in a theoretical mill.—Mr. Clark's figures here are not based on actual manufacturing experience or results. His results are impossible for the following among other reasons:

Paragraph 173. His estimated production is too great. Paragraph 174. He does not include part of the cost of carrying his wool which he buys at a fixed price on a year's contract. His estimate of the amount of wool necessary is too small. Paragraph 174. He figures his waste between the yarn and the finished cloth as 3 per cent instead of 10 per cent. Present price of the wool which he figures at 11½d. is now 14½d. American manufacturers say unanimously that it is impossible to produce the fabric on the details of construction given by him. Letter of Mr. Dunn to this effect quoted. Paragraph 176. He estimates a larger return of tops, i. e., 46 pounds, per 100 pounds of wool, as against about 40 pounds in his testimony before the committee.

Paragraph 176. Double the cost of plant, equipment, and manufacturing requires double profits to give the same rate of compensation.

Paragraph 176. Conclusion.—Mr. Clark's report confirms the fact that reliable information as to foreign costs is not obtainable and suggests a doubt as to the correctness of the basis on which the American costs of samples A, B, C, and D were figured.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin is willing, I should be glad if the article which I have just asked to have printed might follow immediately the one that he asked to have inserted in the RECORD last night.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I prefer that it should take its place in the proceedings of to-day. As I said last night, it emanates from interested parties and is a prejudiced criticism of the work of the government expert in the report which he made to the Government as to industries in Great Britain.

Mr. WARREN. I withdraw the request. Let it go into the RECORD in regular course.

Mr. President, there have been two or three articles—I do not know whether they are exactly the same—from an expert, Mr. Dale, printed in the RECORD, and, as they have called up a great question, I have here some practical suggestions relating to the same matter from the National Woolen Manufacturers' Association, which I ask may go into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming will be agreed to. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1909.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The attack by Mr. Samuel S. Dale, of Boston, on the compensatory duties of Schedule A—an attack brought before the Senate by Senators opposed to the present tariff system—is no new line of hostility. Precisely the same attack, based on similar figures, can be found in the congressional debates in every tariff revision for forty years.

This method is perfectly familiar. It is well known that the shrinkage of wool varies so greatly that of some kinds of wool in the raw state only 2 pounds are required to make a pound of finished cloth, while of other wools 6 pounds are required. Mr. Dale has followed the usual expedient of limiting his examination chiefly or altogether to wools of low shrinkage, which of course give the desired result.

In reply to Mr. Dale we desire to submit the testimony of a large group of representative practical manufacturers, already presented to the Committee on Ways and Means. These statements are based upon standard fabrics in large use. They show that in the making of these fabrics from 3½ to upward of 4 pounds of unwashed wool have actually been required to make 1 pound of finished cloth, and that therefore on these standard goods the present compensatory duties are no more than adequate.

Mr. Dale is one of many editors engaged in writing on the textile industries. The publication to which he is attached is not the single organ of the wool industry, as has been represented to the Senate, but is one of several publications. The majority of these publications, and presumably the majority of these editors, are not in accord with Mr. Dale in his attitude toward the protective tariff and the wool schedule.

Without disparagement of Mr. Dale, it may be fairly said that the manufacturers whose testimony as to the adequacy of the compensatory duties are submitted herewith, have had a very much larger experience than Mr. Dale in practical wool manufacture, and are qualified to speak out of a very much broader observation.

Sincerely, yours,

WINTHROP L. MARVIN, Secretary.

COMPENSATORY DUTIES.

STATEMENTS OF PRACTICAL MANUFACTURERS AS SUBMITTED TO THE
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WOOL MANUFACTURERS.

The statement of an average shrinkage of 60.5 per cent in American wools represents the loss up to and including the scouring process—not the further shrinkage in the various processes of manufacture. On this point we now present the largest amount of testimony from practical manufacturers ever procured and given to Congress. First are the letters of a group of manufacturers who state the shrinkage between the greasy wool and the finished cloth.

Thomas Oakes & Co., of Bloomfield, N. J., submit five samples of carded woolen cloth, in which from 3 pounds to 4.16 pounds of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of finished cloth, and also four samples of worsteds in which from 3.7 to 4 pounds of greasy wool are required to make a pound of finished cloth.

The Talbot Mills, of North Billerica, Mass., submit two samples of carded woolen cloth, and state that it requires 3.52 pounds of greasy wool to make a pound of finished cloth.

S. Slater & Sons, of Webster, Mass., submit two samples of black broadcloths, in one of which 3.69 pounds of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of finished cloth, and in the other 4.64 pounds of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of finished cloth.

M. T. Stevens & Sons Company, of North Andover, Mass., submit three samples of dress goods and three of broadcloths, in which from 3.34 to 4.03 pounds of greasy wool are required to produce 1 pound of finished cloth.

The Globe Woolen Company, of Utica, N. Y., submit samples and state that 3 pounds 1 ounce of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of carded woolen cloth, and that 2 pounds 9 ounces and 2 pounds 15 ounces of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of worsted cloth, according to the samples presented.

The Forstmann & Huffmann Company, of Passaic, N. J., state that 100 pounds of greasy wool will yield from 24 to 34 pounds of finished cloth, according to samples submitted by the company.

The letters in full are as follows:

BLOOMFIELD, N. J., December 16, 1908.

Mr. WILLIAM WHITMAN,

President National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

DEAR SIR: At the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee, held at Washington on the 2d instant, many of the questions asked and some of the testimony filed with that committee indicated a very erroneous and exaggerated idea of the compensatory duty as now incorporated in the Dingley tariff laws.

To convince ourselves as to the real facts, we have examined our own records as manufacturers of fine woolsens and worsteds, and herewith submit to you samples of our product, with all particulars pertaining to their manufacture. We have selected such cloths as are made of fine wools, both foreign and domestic, in order to give a fair and comprehensive comparison as to the compensatory duty at its present ratio of 4 to 1.

We have given this our careful attention, taking the data used from our books in the different departments, and we stand ready to vouch for its accuracy.

We wish to say that we manufacture all our yarns, both woolen and worsteds, and use only the finer qualities of wool, and no cotton is used whatever. Our woolen goods are largely faced or napped goods, and the loss in weight is probably greater in their manufacture than any other class of woolen goods, due to excessive fulling or felting, napping, and shearing.

We submit five samples of woolen goods designated by letters A, B, C, D, E.

Carded woolen cloth.

Fabric.	Wool made of—	Grease wool required.	Cloth finished.
		Pounds.	Pound.
A—Kersey.....	Australian geelong, 80's.....	3.00	1
B—Uniform.....	XXX territory.....	4.16	1
C—Beaver uniform.....	XXX Ohio.....	3.7	1
D—Doeskin uniform.....	XXX territory.....	4.05	1
E—Kersey.....	Cape.....	3.84	1

Worsted cloths made of combed wools.

We also submit four samples of worsteds, as follows, viz:

	Wool made of—	Grease wool required.	Cloth finished.
		Pounds.	Pound.
F.....	Ohiodelaine.....	3.7	1
G.....	do.....	3.85	1
H.....	Fine territory.....	4	1
I.....	Ohiodelaine.....	3.7	1

Yours, very truly,

THOS. OAKES & CO.

TALBOT MILLS,

North Billerica, Mass., December 18, 1908.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, ESQ.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
683 Atlantic avenue, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours 11th instant, I send you herewith the following samples of carded woolen cloths:

A, piece dye cassimere, weighing 11½ ounces to 56 inches in width. B, piece dye carriage lining, weighing 7½ ounces to 54 inches in width. The latter is really what would be called a sacking. These are both made from a blend of 50 per cent fine Texas, eight months, shrinking 63 per cent, and 50 per cent California, eight months, shrinking 60 per cent.

It takes 3.52 pounds of this wool to make 1 pound of finished cloth.

Yours, truly,

FREDERIC S. CLARK, President.

S. SLATER & SONS (INCORPORATED) WOOLEN MILL,
Webster, Mass., January 5, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, ESQ.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging receipt of your letter of December 11, we would report as follows:

A. With this letter please find two samples of black broadcloths made of carded wools.

B. The quantity of greasy wool in 1 pound of each cloth (by greasy wool meaning before sorting), Silesian twill, 3.69 pounds; 444 cloth, 4.64 pounds.

C. The class and character of the wool in the Silesian twill is first-class XXX grade clothing wool.

D. The Silesian twill is made of one-half fine Australian foreign and half fine Ohio domestic, and the 444 cloth is made entirely of domestic wool. We do not make worsted cloths, so can not send samples or answer the questions under that heading.

Respectfully,

FRANK BULKELEY SMITH, Treasurer.

M. T. STEVENS & SONS COMPANY,
North Andover, Mass., January 1, 1909.

Goods.	Weight per square yard.	Quality of stock.	Pounds wool required to produce one pound of goods.
	Ounces.		
E—Dress goods.....	3.75	Fine medium territory.....	3.71
F—Dress goods.....	4.5	do.....	3.66
D—Dress goods.....	5.7	do.....	3.89
A—Broadcloth.....	5.5	do.....	3.84
B—Broadcloth.....	6.3	do.....	4.03
C—Broadcloth.....	6.9	Cape and Port Phillip.....	3.34

GLOBE WOOLEN COMPANY,
Utica, N. Y., December 29, 1908.

Mr. WILLIAM WHITMAN,
Harding-Whitman Company, 78 Chauncy street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We inclose statement regarding carded woolen cloths and worsted cloths made from combed wools, as you have requested, and which we trust will convey the information you desire.

We also return the letter written by Mr. Robert Middleton to Mr. Rufus S. Frost.

Under separate cover we have sent you samples of cloth described in the statement inclosed.

Yours, truly,

GLOBE WOOLEN COMPANY.

Carded woolen cloth.

Sam- ples.	Greasy wool in 1 pound of cloth.	Class.	Character.	Foreign or domestic.
T.C.....	3 pounds 1 ounce.....	1	XX. Ohio clothing washed.	Domestic.
13.....	do.....	1	do.....	Do.

Worsted cloths made of combed wool.

Samples.	Greasy wool in 1 pound of cloth.	Class.	Character.	Foreign or domestic.
1103.....	2 pounds 9 ounces ...	1	Ohio's unwashed	Domestic.
319½.....	2 pounds 15 ounces ..	1	80's Australian	Australian.

FORSTMANN, HUFFMANN & Co.,
Passaic, N. J., January 8, 1909.

STATEMENTS REGARDING SAMPLES OF WOOL AND CLOTH.

Out of 100 pounds of imported greasy wool (sample No. 8) we produce 33 pounds of cloth No. VI.

Out of 100 pounds of scoured wool of the same grade (sample No. 12) we produce 81 pounds of finished cloth No. VI.

Out of 100 pounds of the greasy wool which is used for the manufacture of cloths Nos. IV, V, and VII, and which is also imported, we produce 24 pounds of finished cloth.

Out of 100 pounds of scoured wool of the same grade (sample No. 10) we produce 78 pounds of the three above-mentioned cloths Nos. IV, V, and VII.

Out of 100 pounds of greasy wool No. 9, which is of domestic origin, we produce 31 pounds of cloth No. I, 34 pounds of cloth No. II, and 32 pounds of cloth No. III.

Out of 100 pounds of scoured wool of the same grade of domestic wool (sample No. 11) we produce 78 pounds of cloth No. I, 84 pounds of cloth No. II, and 81 pounds of cloth No. III.

Taking into consideration the fact that the cost of freight and wages for sorting and scouring wool are much higher for the American than for the European manufacturer, the duty of 44 cents per pound on such finished cloths as are represented by samples Nos. I to VII does not give any protection with the duty of 11 cents per pound on greasy wool.

JULIUS FORSTMANN.

FROM WOOL TO TOPS.

An important statement from Harry Hartley & Co., top manufacturers, of Boston, is submitted, showing the amount of top produced from various wools grown in the United States. This shows that 100 pounds of fine merino territory wool yields 21.73 pounds of tops; 100 pounds of fine medium territory wool yields 24.45 pounds of tops; 100 pounds of medium half-blood territory wool yields 28.80 pounds of tops; 100 pounds of fine unwashed Ohio and Michigan wool yields 26.47 pounds of tops; 100 pounds of average fine Texas wool yields 24.45 pounds of tops; 100 pounds of twelve months' Texas wool, long staple, yields 27.90 pounds of tops; and 100 pounds of quarter-blood territory wool yields 37.30 pounds of tops. This statement further confirms the soundness of the proposition that 4 pounds of wool are, on the average, required to produce a pound of finished cloth. It should be remembered that from the top there is a further considerable shrinkage in the process of manufacturing. The statement of Harry Hartley & Co. is, in full, as follows:

HARRY HARTLEY & CO. (INC.).

Particulars of amount of top yielded by various wools grown in the United States.

Fine merino territory wool (American). Take 100 pounds: Taking off string, dung locks, and refuse (4 per cent) leaves 96 pounds of sorted wool. Shrinking, 70 per cent, yielding 80 per cent of clean wool, yields 28.80 pounds of scoured wool. In carding it makes 8 per cent of card and burr waste, yields 26.50 pounds of carded silver. In combing it makes 18 per cent of noll (waste), yields 21.73 pounds of top. Result, 100 pounds of fine territory wool yields 21.73 pounds of top.

As the shrinkage of fine territory wool varies from 68 to 73 per cent, I have taken an average shrinkage as 70 per cent.

Fine medium territory wool. Take 100 pounds: Taking off strings, dung locks, and refuse (4 per cent) leaves 96 pounds of sorted wool. Shrinking 67 per cent, yielding 33 per cent of clean wool, yields 31.68 pounds of scoured wool. In carding it makes 7 per cent of card and burr waste, yields 29.46 pounds of carded silver. In combing it makes 17 per cent of noll (waste), leaves 24.45 pounds of top. Result, 100 pounds of fine medium territory wool yields 24.45 pounds of top.

Medium half-blood territory wool (American). Take 100 pounds: Taking off string, dung locks, ribs, and refuse (4 per cent) leaves 96 pounds of sorted wool. Shrinking 62 per cent, yielding 38 per cent of scoured wool, yields 36.48 pounds of scoured wool. In carding it makes 6 per cent of card and burr waste, yields 34.29 pounds of carded wool. In combing it makes 16 per cent of noll (waste), yields 28.80 pounds of top. Result, 100 pounds of half-blood territory wool yields 28.80 pounds of top.

Fine unwashed Ohio and Michigan wool. Take 100 pounds: Taking off strings, dung locks, and refuse (8 per cent) leaves 92 pounds of sorted wool. Shrinking 64 per cent, yielding 36 per cent, yields 33.12 pounds of scoured wool. In carding it makes 5 per cent of card and burr waste, yields 31.46 pounds of carded silver. In combing it makes 15 per cent of noll (waste), leaves 26.74 pounds of top. Result, 100 pounds of fine unwashed Ohio and Michigan wool yields 26.47 pounds of top.

Average fine Texas wool. Take 100 pounds: Taking off strings, dung locks, and refuse (4 per cent) leaves 96 pounds sorted wool. Shrinking 67 per cent, yielding 33 per cent, yields 31.68 pounds scoured wool. In carding it makes 7 per cent of card and burr waste, 29.46 pounds carded silver. In combing it makes 17 per cent of nolls (waste), 24.45 pounds top. Result, 100 pounds of average fine Texas wool yield 24.45 pounds top.

Twelve months' Texas wool, long staple. Take 100 pounds: Taking off string, tags (dung locks), and refuse (3 per cent) leaves 97 pounds sorted wool. Shrinking 64 per cent, yielding 36 per cent of scoured

wool, 34.92 pounds scoured wool. In carding it makes 6 per cent of card and bur waste, 32.82 pounds carded sliver. In combing it makes 15 per cent of nolls (waste), 27.90 pounds top. Result, 100 pounds of merino Texas yields 27.90 pounds top.

Quarter-blood territory wool (American). Take 100 pounds: Taking off strings, dung locks, ribs, and refuse (3 per cent) leaves 97 pounds sorted wool. Shrinkage 54 per cent, yielding 46 per cent of scoured wool, 44.62 pounds scoured wool. In carding it makes 5 per cent of card and bur waste, 42.39 pounds carded sliver. In combing into top it makes 12 per cent of nolls, 37.30 pounds top. Result, 100 pounds of quarter-blood territory yields 37.30 pounds top.

SCoured WOOL TO CLOTH.

The statements submitted above have shown the total shrinkage from mited below show separately the shrinkage from the scoured wool to the top, a partially manufactured product. Further statements submitted below show separately the shrinkage from the scoured wool to the finished cloth in the processes of manufacturing, and in some cases also the shrinkage from the greasy wool to the scoured wool. That 3 pounds of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of scoured wool has long been a fundamental proposition in the framing of the tariffs of the United States. These statements that follow show conclusively the additional shrinkage from the scoured wool to the finished fabric.

The Talbot Mills, of North Billerica, Mass., state that on the basis of their three samples submitted it requires 1½ pounds of scoured wool to produce 1 pound of cloth.

The Botany Worsted Mills, of Passaic, N. J., whose managers have important experience on both sides of the ocean, state that the loss between the top and the finished dress goods approximates from 15 to 20 per cent, and that 100 pounds of scoured wool produces about 60 to 65 per cent of finished cloth, and give other important particulars. Four samples of dress goods are submitted.

The Hockanum Company, of Rockville, Conn., submits samples of fine worsteds made from Australian yarn, and states that 100 pounds of yarn in the gray produces 81.2 pounds of finished cloth.

The Globe Woolen Company, of Utica, N. Y., submits samples of carded woolen and worsted cloth, and states that 1 pound of scoured wool will yield 11.25 ounces of woolen cloth, and that 1 pound of scoured wool will yield in one sample 10.41 ounces, and in another 11.40 ounces of worsted cloth.

George E. Kunhardt, of Lawrence, Mass., submits eight samples of wools, worsteds, and serges, and states that in one fabric 1 pound of scoured wool yields 0.78 pound of finished cloth, and in the other 1 pound of scoured wool yields 0.83 pound of finished cloth.

The Rock Manufacturing Company, of Rockville, Conn., submits a sample of uniform cloth, and states that 4,000 pounds of fine domestic wool in the grease will yield 1,280 pounds of clean white wool, and that this wool will yield 921.60 pounds of finished cloth.

The Waterloo Woolen Manufacturing Company submits two samples of blue broadcloth, and states that the quantity of scoured wool in each pound of cloth is approximately 1½ pounds. It adds that although the shrinkage of the Australian wool used in one of the samples is given as 56 per cent.

It is proper to state that in Europe similar goods are made from wools of a much higher shrinkage. On account of the specific duty on wool, it is necessary to select for importation such as is of low shrinkage. Owing to the relatively small quantity of this, there is keen competition among purchasers for America. It follows that European manufacturers obtain equally good wool of heavier shrinkage at a lower price per scoured pound. It follows also that America can import only in very limited quantities the fine wools grown in South America and the Cape of Good Hope.

Thomas Oakes & Co., of Bloomfield, N. J., state that from 1.38 to 1.44 pounds of scoured wool are required to produce a pound of finished cloth, according to samples submitted by them.

M. T. Stevens & Sons Co., of North Andover, Mass., submit samples of dress goods and broadcloth, and state that from 1.30 to 1.40 pounds of scoured wool are required to produce 1 pound of cloth.

The letters are published below:

TALBOT MILLS,
North Billerica, Mass., January 2, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, Esq.,
President National Association Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of December 30, the samples already sent in A and B, require 1½ pounds of scoured wool per pound of cloth.

Yours, truly,

FREDERIC S. CLARK, President.

Passaic, N. J., January 4, 1909.

WM. WHITMAN, Esq.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your esteemed favors of December 15 and 18, 1908, and as requested, we beg to reply to your several queries as follows:

1. One hundred pounds wool in the grease usually yield from 25 per cent in territory up to 44 per cent of best Australian finished top.
2. One hundred pounds wool in the grease render the following results:

	Australian.	Fine territory.	One-half blood domestic.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Sorted wool.....about.....	83	80	80
Top and noll.....do.....	44½	26	32
Tops, standard condition.....do.....	39½	21½	27½

3. The loss between top and finished dress goods approximates 15 per cent to 22 per cent.

4. One hundred pounds scoured wool would produce about 60 per cent to 65 per cent finished cloth.

5. Regarding the question of comparative scale of wages here and as paid on the European continent, we beg to say that so far as we are informed the wages in this country are at least twice that paid abroad, and in many cases three times higher.

The Australian wools that we use are the lighter shrinkage wools from that country, which, under existing conditions, we can import to

better advantage than the heavier shrinkage wools which form the bulk of the clip.

By express we are sending you four specimens of our dress goods, marked as follows:

"Style No. 3 (low);" "style No. 6 (med.);" "style No. 7 (fine);" "style No. 4 (best)," which we hope will serve your purpose.

We also take pleasure in acknowledging receipt of your favor on the 2d instant, with pamphlet referred to by you, for which we thank you.

We trust the above information will aid you in convincing the Ways and Means Committee of the importance that the compensatory duties as now fixed be maintained on our class of goods, and that they will see the justice to so recommend the present tariff to be continued in the new tariff law they intend to introduce.

We remain, yours, very truly,

BOTANY WORSTED MILLS,
FERD. KUHN, Treasurer.

HOCKANUM COMPANY,
Rockville, Conn., January 6, 1909.

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN,
78 Chauncy street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: At your request we are sending you a number of samples of fine worsteds made from Australian worsted yarns. Our experience in manufacturing these goods is that they show an average shrinking from the worsted yarn in the gray to the finished cloth of 19 per cent, and we account for this 19 per cent shrinking as follows: Six per cent loss in dyeing; 5½ per cent loss in waste; 8½ per cent loss in finishing. Thus, 100 pounds of yarn in gray produces 94 pounds after dyeing, 88.7 pounds greasy cloth, 81.2 pounds of finished cloth.

Trusting that this is what you want,

Yours, very truly,

F. T. MAXWELL, Treasurer.

GLOBE WOOLEN COMPANY,
Utica, N. Y., January 1, 1909.

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN, President,
683 Atlantic avenue, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of December 30 received. Inclosed please find statement showing weight of finished cloth in each of the samples we sent you that can be made from 1 pound of scoured wool. The inclosed statement, taken in connection with our statements sent you dated December 23, 1908, will show the details of shrinkage from greasy wool to finished cloth.

The 80 Australian referred to means grade of wool and not size of yarn.

Yours, truly,

GLOBE WOOLEN COMPANY,
JOHN SIMSON, Superintendent.

Carded woolen cloth.

Sample.	Weight of scoured wool.	Weight of finished cloth.
	Ounces.	Ounces.
Tc.....	16	11.25
13.....	16	11.25

Worsted cloths made of combed wool.

Sample.	Weight of scoured wool.	Weight of finished cloth.
	Ounces.	Ounces.
1103.....	16	11.40
3193.....	16	10.41

LAWRENCE, MASS., January 4, 1909.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: With reference to your favor of December 31, and answering the inquiries you made in your letter of December 11, we are herewith inclosing eight reference samples: First, two fancy woolsens, our 5600 and 6000 lines; second, three fancy worsteds, our 4450, 5250, and 5200 lines; and third, serges, our 160, 180, and 300.

In paragraph 3 we designate the loss between scoured wool and finished cloth on our woolen fabrics.

We hope this matter is sent you in satisfactory shape.

Yours, faithfully,

GEORGE E. KUNHARDT.

I. Carded woolen cloths.

A.	B.	C.	D.	
5600....	4 pounds 9 ounces.....	Class 1..	Domestic.	Fall California.
6000....	3 pounds 1 ounce.....	do.....	do.....	California and territory.

II. Worsted cloths made of worsted yarns.

A.	B yarn.	
160.....	17.3 ounces.....	240s X Arlington gray yarn, colored.
180.....	17.3 ounces.....	242s XXX special Arlington gray yarn.
300.....	17.5 ounces.....	228s Arlington gray yarn.

III. LOSS BETWEEN SCAURED WOOL AND FINISHED CLOTH.

In the above 5,600 line the equivalent for 1 pound of scoured wool is 0.78 pound of finished cloth.
In the above 6,000 line the equivalent for 1 pound of scoured wool is 0.83 pound finished cloth.

MEMORANDUM.

If 1 pound of scoured wool makes 0.78 pound finished cloth, it would require 20.5 ounces of scoured wool to make 1 pound of finished cloth.
If 1 pound of scoured wool makes 0.83 pound finished cloth, it would require 19.3 ounces of scoured wool to make 1 pound of finished cloth.

THE ROCK MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Rockville, Conn., December 17, 1908.

GENTLEMEN: We hand you herewith our method of figuring the cost per finished yarn of the wool used in making an indigo, wool-dyed, steam-finished dark blue uniform cloth, to weigh 16 ounces per linear yard.

Taking 4,000 pounds of fine domestic wool in the grease, there will be a shrinkage during the process of scouring of 68 per cent. This will give 1,280 pounds of clean white wool.

During the various processes of manufacture—carbonizing, coloring, carding, spinning, dressing, weaving, and finishing—there will be an additional shrinkage of 28 per cent, which will leave 921.60 pounds of finished cloth.

	Pounds.
Fine domestic wool in the grease.....	4,000
68 per cent shrinkage during scouring.....	2,720
Clean white wool.....	1,280
28 per cent shrinkage during manufacture.....	358.4
Pounds of finished cloth.....	921.6

Four and one-half pounds of greasy wool to 1 pound of cloth.

We hand you below a sample of the cloth produced by the above schedule.

Truly, yours,

THE ROCK MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

WATERLOO WOOLEN MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
New York, January 4, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, Esq.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your various communications, I have sent you two samples, as follows:

CARDED WOOLEN CLOTHS.

(1) Blue broadcloth, 54 inches wide inside selvage, weight 16 ounces per linear yard, made from Australian 70s merino; quantity of greasy wool in each pound of cloth, 55 ounces, on the basis of 56 per cent shrinkage. Quantity of scoured wool in each pound of cloth, approximately 1½ pounds.

(2) Blue broadcloth, 54 inches wide inside selvage, weight 16 ounces per linear yard, made from fine unwashed fleece wool grown in Ohio, West Virginia, or Pennsylvania; quantity of greasy wool in each pound of cloth, 67 ounces, on the basis of 64 per cent shrinkage. Quantity of scoured wool in each pound of cloth, approximately 1½ pounds.

2. We do not make worsted cloths from combed wools.
3. We spin all of the woolen yarns used in our fabrics.
Although the shrinkage of the Australian wool used in sample No. 1 is given as 56 per cent, it is proper to state that in Europe similar goods are made from wools of a much higher shrinkage. On account of the specific duty on wool, it is necessary to select for importation such as is of low shrinkage. Owing to the relatively small quantity of this there is keen competition among purchasers for America. It follows that European manufacturers obtain equally good wool of heavier shrinkage at a lower price per scoured pound. It follows also that America can import only in very limited quantities the fine wools grown in South America and the Cape of Good Hope.

It is stated above that approximately 1½ pounds of scoured wools are required to make 1 pound of goods. This is subject to variation, depending on the amount of vegetable matter, kemp, and short fiber in each purchase of wool, upon the amount of finish given the cloth, and is also influenced by the fact that most broadcloth manufacturers deliver goods weighing more than the contract calls for. Thus 1½ pounds of scoured wool will produce sometimes .975 pound of cloth, sometimes 1.08 pounds of cloth, the variation between these limits depending on the factors mentioned above.

Yours, truly,

WATERLOO WOOLEN MANUFACTURING CO.,
A. M. PATTERSON, President.

BLOOMFIELD, N. J., January 9, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, Esq.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We have your favor of yesterday's date requesting that we send the quantity represented in pounds of scoured wool required for 1 pound of finished cloth in the several samples previously sent to you. We forwarded yesterday the same information represented by percentages, but now inclose the same, as you request, in pounds:

Pounds scoured wool to 1 pound finished wool.

Woolens:	
Sample A.....	1.44
Sample B.....	1.41
Sample C.....	1.40
Sample D.....	1.38
Sample E.....	1.38
Worsted:	
Sample F.....	1.41
Sample G.....	1.42
Sample H.....	1.44
Sample I.....	1.41

The results, so far as our samples are concerned, are so uniform we think an average of 1.40 would fairly represent the scoured quantity for 1 pound finished product.

Yours, truly,

THOMAS OAKES & CO.

M. T. STEVENS & SONS COMPANY,
North Andover, Mass., January 11, 1909.

Goods.	Weight per square yard.	Quality of stock.	Pounds clean wool required to produce one pound of goods.
Dress goods:	Ounces.		
E.....	3.75	Fine medium territory...	1.80
F.....	4.5	do.....	1.80
D.....	5.7	do.....	1.82
Broadcloth:			
A.....	5.5	do.....	1.82
B.....	6.3	do.....	1.4
C.....	6.9	Cape and Port Phillip....	1.4

A SUMMARIZED STATEMENT.

The tables of Harry Hartley & Co. show the actual quantity in pounds of wool top, worsted yarn, and finished goods made from 100 pounds of greasy wool in the bale, and the equivalent number of pounds of greasy wool required for the cloth, recapitulated as follows:

Character of wool.	Pounds of tops.	Pounds of worsted yarn.	Pounds of finished goods.	Equivalent of greasy wool in cloth.
Fine merino territory.....	21.73	20.64	17.55	5.7
Fine medium territory.....	24.45	23.23	19.75	5.1
Medium one-half blood territory.....	28.80	27.36	23.27	4.3
Fine medium unwashed Ohio and Michigan.....	26.47	25.15	21.38	4.7
Average fine Texas.....	24.45	23.23	19.75	5.1
Twelve months Texas, long staple.....	27.90	26.50	22.53	4.4
One-quarter blood territory.....	37.80	35.43	30.12	3.3

From the best estimate obtainable the average shrinkage from greasy wool to scoured wool of the entire wool product of the United States is at least 60 per cent.

On this basis, 100 pounds of such greasy wool would, as a broad, general statement, yield, on the average, 97½ pounds of sorts, 39 pounds of scoured wool, 31.2 pounds of top, 29½ pounds of worsted yarn, 25 pounds of finished worsted cloth.

From the testimony already received we have the following results:
Carded woolen cloths.—Ten exhibits; 24 samples from mills making finished goods from greasy wool bought in the bale. Average, 3.73 pounds of wool to 1 pound of cloth; lowest, 3 pounds; highest, 4.64 pounds.

Carded woolen cloths.—Eight exhibits; 28 samples showing the amount of scoured wool required to make 1 pound of finished cloth. Average, 1.37 pounds; lowest, 1.20 pounds; highest, 1.55 pounds.

Compensating duty required on the basis of scoured wool dutiable at 33 cents equals 45.21 cents.

Worsted cloths from mills making their own tops and yarns.—Three exhibits; 12 samples. Average, 3.66 pounds of wool to 1 pound of finished cloth; lowest, 2.56 pounds; highest, 4.55 pounds.

Worsted cloths from mills making their own tops and yarns.—Three exhibits; 12 samples showing the number of pounds of scoured wool required to make 1 pound of finished cloth. Average, 1.55 pounds of scoured wool to 1 pound of finished cloth; lowest, 1.40 pounds; highest, 1.78 pounds.

Compensating duty required on the basis of scoured wool dutiable at 33 cents equals 51.15 cents.

Worsted cloths made by manufacturers who purchase their worsted yarns, showing loss between yarn and cloth.—Two exhibits; 11 samples; 8 Australian worsted yarn; 1 Australian and territory yarn; 2 fine medium territory yarn; 18.84 ounces of worsted yarn are required to make 1 pound of finished goods; shrinkage, 15+ per cent.

These exact statements, drawn from the actual business experience of representative importers of wool and manufacturers of woolen and worsted fabrics, are strong cumulative testimony that the standard of 4 pounds of greasy wool to 1 pound of finished cloth, the long-recognized basis of the compensatory duty, is a just standard, and that it ought to be embodied in the wool and woolen schedule of the tariff law which the Committee on Ways and Means is now considering. It is not denied that there are wools less than 4 pounds of which will produce a pound of cloth.

Those hostile interests which attack our compensatory duty as a part of the protective system are in the habit of selecting such wools, as has been done by certain English manufacturers of Bradford, in a brief submitted to your committee by their representatives, F. Butterfield & Co., of New York. But, on the other hand, there are wools in constant use in this country, of both foreign and domestic production, more than 4 pounds of which are required to produce a pound of finished cloth.

That statement of Senator ALDRICH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, which we have already quoted, goes right to the heart of this question of compensatory duties when, referring to the foes of a protective policy, Senator ALDRICH says:

"They have selected certain kinds of wool, and declared that in these particular instances the proportion of shrinkage and waste is only as 2 or 3 pounds of wool to 1 of cloth. I grant there are such instances; but as it is the weakest link in the chain or the lowest point in the levee that determines efficiency, so we are bound to take the highest shrinkage wools accessible to foreigners and to calculate the compensatory duty on the basis of these. If our manufacturers are excluded from the use of this class of wools, their competitors do use them, and it is against these that the equalization of conditions is to be effected."

"Again, it has been argued that the formula is wrong, because certain fabrics are produced in which 4 pounds of wool, even of this high-shrinking quality, are not required to manufacture a pound of goods, while the compensatory duty is fixed at four times the wool duty. Goods woven on cotton warps or containing some admixture of

shoddy are cited. I grant the facts in this instance also. But we must, as I have already shown, arrange the compensation on the basis of the best cloths; otherwise we should determine, by our legislation, that the manufacture in this country shall be confined to the lower grades of goods. That would be to affix the brand of permanent inferiority upon our woolen manufactures. Nor is it possible in a tariff bill to so adjust a system of compensatory duties that it shall exactly fit the amount of wool consumed in an almost infinite variety of fabrics."

Another objection that may be urged to accepting the proportion of 4 pounds of wool to 1 pound of cloth, and allowing a compensatory duty on this basis, is that the great shrinkage in the wool is not always fully lost—as in the case of nolls, for instance. But the manifest reply to this, which has been presented before and is now emphasized again, is that though these nolls have a value, that value is very much less than the foreign or original cost of the wool from which they were made—less than the foreign cost of the wool, exclusive of the duty. Thus, it is plain that the manufacturer, who pays the duty on the wool and the nolls included in it, does not recover the duty paid upon the nolls when he sells them. Therefore the value of the nolls can rightfully be eliminated from the calculation.

What the tariff makers have sought in past years is to fix a fair average standard, sufficient under all normal circumstances to compensate American wool manufacturers for the relatively high rates of duty which they are required to pay upon their raw material. This standard of 4 pounds of greasy wool to 1 pound of cloth, though often assailed by rival foreign manufacturing interests and their representatives in the United States, has stood the test of forty years of critical examination, and we urge you respectfully that it once more be adopted by your committee in the preparation of the new tariff law.

Very truly, yours,

William Whitman, Boston, president and chairman ex officio; Frederic S. Clark, North Billerica, Mass.; Walter Erben, Philadelphia, Pa.; Louis B. Goodall, Sanford, Me.; Edwin Farnham Greene, Boston, Mass.; Joseph R. Grundy, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Hopewell, Boston, Mass.; George E. Kunhardt, Lawrence, Mass.; J. R. MacColl, Pawtucket, R. I.; Francis T. Maxwell, Rockville, Conn.; J. F. Maynard, Utica, N. Y.; Thomas Oakes, Bloomfield, N. J.; Winthrop L. Marvin, Secretary, Tariff Committee National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

COMPENSATORY DUTIES.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS, FEBRUARY 10, 1909.

BOSTON, MASS., February 9, 1909.

HON. SERENO E. PAYNE,

Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to submit to you herewith some supplementary statements from manufacturers relative to the compensatory duties, showing the amount of greasy wool required to make a pound of cloth, the shrinkage between top and yarn, etc.

The American Woolen Company submits 10 samples of woolen and worsted fabrics, and states that from 3.34 to 4.55 pounds of greasy wool are required to produce 1 pound of these fabrics.

John and James Dobson, of the Falls of Schuylkill Carpet and Plush Mills, submit four samples of cloths, and state that with the exception of the Australian wool it takes more than 4 pounds of unwashed wool to make a pound of these cloths—the Australian a little less.

The Middlesex Company submits two samples of uniform cloth, and states that a little more than 4 pounds of greasy wool are required to make 1 pound of one of these fabrics and slightly over 5 pounds to make 1 pound of the other.

Statements of the Pocasset Worsted Company, S. Slater & Sons, the Standish Worsted Company, and the Dunn Worsted Mills relate to the shrinkage between tops and yarn, yarn and cloth, scoured wool and cloth, etc.

This testimony is confirmatory of other statements of manufacturers already submitted by us to your committee.

We submit, also, a statement of Brown & Adams, wool commission merchants of Boston, that Australian fine wools will shrink from 45 to 65 per cent, Cape wools from 55 to 75 per cent, and South American wools from 50 to 72 per cent—confirming in general statements already filed with the committee from John G. Wright and Farnsworth, Thayer & Stevenson, that 4 pounds of greasy wool to 1 pound of finished cloth is the proper basis of a compensatory duty.

Very truly, yours,

William Whitman, Boston, president and chairman ex officio; Frederic S. Clark, North Billerica, Mass.; Charles H. Harding, Philadelphia, Pa.; Louis B. Goodall, Sanford, Me.; Joseph R. Grundy, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Hopewell, Boston, Mass.; John P. Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. R. MacColl, Pawtucket, R. I.; Francis T. Maxwell, Rockville, Conn.; J. F. Maynard, Utica, N. Y., and Thomas Oakes, Bloomfield, N. J., tariff committee, National Association of Wool Manufacturers; Winthrop L. Marvin, secretary.

AMERICAN WOOLEN COMPANY,

WM. M. WOOD, President,
Boston, Mass., January 18, 1909.

WM. WHITMAN, Esq.,

President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
78 Chauncey Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We forward you herewith samples of woolen and worsted fabrics and trust the information given below is what you require.

Sample "A": 9½ ounces broadcloth made from domestic wool. Requires 4 pounds of grease wool or 22½ ounces of clean wool to make 1 pound of cloth.

Sample "B": 20 ounces kersey made of Australian wool. Requires 3½ pounds of grease wool or 22 ounces of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "C": 16 ounces kersey made from Australian wool. Requires 3½ pounds of grease wool or 22 ounces clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "D": 17 ounces indigo kersey made from domestic wool. Requires 4 pounds of grease wool or 22½ ounces clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "1": 13½ ounces worsted cloth made from domestic wool. Requires 3.34 pounds of grease wool or 1.64 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "2": 16 ounces worsted made of territory wool. Requires 4.24 pounds of grease wool or 1.70 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "3": 18 ounces worsted made from territory wool. Requires 4.34 pounds of grease wool or 1.78 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "4": 16 ounces worsted made from territory wool. Requires 4.55 pounds of grease wool or 1.54 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "5": 15 ounces worsted made from Australian wool. Requires 3.37 pounds of grease wool or 1.61 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Sample "6": 18 ounces worsted made from Australian wool. Requires 3.37 pounds of grease wool or 1.61 pounds of clean wool per pound of cloth.

Yours, truly,

AMERICAN WOOLEN COMPANY,
C. J. BOEFISH,
Manufacturing Secretary.

FALLS OF SCHUYLKILL.

CARPET AND PLUSH MILLS,
Philadelphia, January 16, 1909.

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN,

President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,

Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I herewith send you four different samples of cloths, numbered 1 to 4, inclusive.

No. 1 is a cloth made from all Australian wool. I also send you the amount of scoured fine wool that it will take to make a pound of this cloth, calculated, as you will see, as per sheet inclosed.

I also send you sample marked No. 2, made from half Australian and half domestic fine Montana, with the same calculations.

I also send you samples made from Ohio wool, marked No. 3, with the same calculations.

I also send you samples No. 4, made from territory wool, with calculations.

In making these calculations, I take 4 pounds of each kind of wool in unwashed condition. I think you will find these calculations as near accurate as it is possible to get them. The shrinkage of wools you can ascertain in Boston as well as I can. Of course, these are from actual experience. The higher the finish of the goods in the way of broadcloth, the more the shrinkage will be.

You will notice that the manufacture of broadcloth is a very different proposition from the manufacture of a worsted piece of goods. In many cases these goods are in the fulling mills for a whole day to be felted; the higher the felting the heavier the loss.

You will notice that, with the exception of the Australian wool, it takes more than 4 pounds of unwashed wool to make a pound of cloth; the Australian takes a little less. The wools grown in Silesia, in Russia, and the Cape of Good Hope have a much higher shrinkage than the Australian wools, but the average is about the American standard of shrinkage.

Hoping the above information will be of service to you, I remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES DOBSON.

MIDDLESEX COMPANY,
Lowell, Mass., January 14, 1909.

WM. WHITMAN, Esq.,

President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,

Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I beg to hand you herewith two samples of cloth manufactured by the Middlesex Company. These are of a type produced by this company for a great many years and are used in making uniforms.

Sample No. 1 is made of fine Ohio wool, and from 100 pounds of wool in the bale we made 24.36 pounds of cloth, or a little more than 4 pounds of wool to a pound of cloth.

Sample No. 2 is made chiefly from Idaho wool, and from 100 pounds of this wool we made 19.87 pounds of cloth, or slightly over 5 pounds of wool to a pound of cloth.

From this it appears that the specific or compensating duty, which is based on the theory that 4 pounds of wool are required to make 1 pound of cloth, is not placed too high as far as it concerns the uniform cloths made by this company.

Yours, respectfully,

C. BROOKS STEVENS, Treasurer.

POCASSET WORSTED COMPANY,
Boston, Mass., January 11, 1909.

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN,

President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,

Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. WHITMAN: Replying to your letter of January 9, I am inclosing a memorandum giving the shrinkage losses from top to worsted yarn for the years 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908. These losses include the invisible losses, and they are exactly as taken from our books. They are figured on the basis of a half-blood quality similar to your 4's quality. During the year 1908 the loss is smaller than during the previous years, and this is accounted for by the fact that we have been using finer qualities of wool. We have found, when using quarter blood, both domestic and foreign, our shrinkage loss to go up as high as 16 per cent, and on low quarter bloods I can readily believe that it will in some instances go above 20 per cent.

I am also inclosing some data giving prices of labor in England for a worsted yarn mill similar to the Pocasset; and also data on the selling price of worsted yarn and worsted tops in various qualities in Bradford in November, 1908. You may find it of interest to tabulate these figures, and they may be of value to your committee in showing the exact conditions, as regards costs, at the present time in this country and Bradford.

Roughly speaking, I find that the labor costs in our own mill are about 130 per cent higher than the costs here given. I think it is fair to assume that general fixed charges in this country are about double to what they are in England. In tabulating some of these figures I seem to find that if the duty on wool is dropped from 11 to 8 cents, it will be necessary to have a larger ad valorem duty on worsted yarn in order to compensate for this drop, especially on yarns from 40's up to

70's. As the tariff is now, we could readily have a little higher tariff on numbers like 70's and 80's, we finding that we have been unable to compete in the general market against yarn imported from Germany and England in these numbers. Of course we do not care to make any great amount in these numbers, but if a scientific duty is arranged it should be arranged so that all classes of worsted yarn should be proportionate in the protection they have from the tariff.

Very truly, yours,

F. C. FLETCHER.

Pocasset Worsted Company—Memorandum of shrinkages between the top and the finished yarn, including waste and invisible loss.

	Per cent.
1905	10.12
1906	10.60
1907	10.12
1908	8.92

These shrinkages are based on a half-blood quality. During the year 1908 the qualities run in the mill were finer than a half-blood; during the other years about an average half-blood. When using three-eighths and quarter-blood wools we have had the shrinkages go as high as 16 per cent. The invisible loss, largely moisture, averages about 2½ per cent.

BOSTON, MASS., January 18, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 15. In the shrinkage report which I gave you there was included the waste made in the spinning, this shrinkage showing the total difference between the pounds of top used during the year and the yarn produced, taking waste of all kinds made in the mill. We find in making tests on small lots that there is a great variation in the percentage of shrinkage, owing to the invisible loss being different on different days. We also find that there is a loss between the tops at 13½ per cent condition and the yarn shipped out of from 2½ to 3 per cent, and our yearly figures of invisible loss bear out the average loss figured from week to week.

Another point which I might mention is that we take a great deal of sliver out of the top in the drawing, seldom finding the top clear enough all the way through to allow none of the sliver to be taken out in one or the other of the preparations. It is possible that we make more waste here than a mill ordinarily would do which makes the tops in its own mill, and to some degree this might account for a seemingly higher proportion of waste than you figure at the Arlington Mills.

Trusting the above answers your question,

Very truly, yours,

F. C. FLETCHER.

MARLBOROUGH-BLENHEIM,
Atlantic City, N. J., January 14, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, Esq.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find original letter from Mr. Spaulding Bartlett to me under date of January 19, answering the questions in yours to me of January 7.

I am, very truly, yours,

FRANK BULKELEY SMITH,
Treas., S. Slater Sons, Inc.

S. SLATER & SON (Incorporated),
Webster, Mass., January 12, 1909.

FRANK BULKELEY SMITH, Esq.,
Marlborough-Blenheim, Atlantic City, N. J.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 11th, from Baltimore, inclosing Mr. Whitman's letter of January 7, is received, and I would answer his questions as follows:

1. Silesian twill. The fine Ohio wool used in the manufacture of this cloth was washed.
2. The 444 cloth was made of unwashed wool, and in using the word "domestic" we do not intend to distinguish it from territory wool because it was made of territory wool, but used the word "domestic" because, in Mr. Whitman's letter of December 11, under the head, "Carded woolen cloths," question D, he asks us to state in the case of each whether it is made of foreign or domestic wool.
3. It takes 20.8 ounces of scoured wool to make 1 pound of finished cloth of the character of the two samples sent him; that is, the Silesian twill and the 444 cloth.

Respectfully,

S. BARTLETT.

B. F. Mellor, president The Standish Worsted Company, makers of high-grade cloth; mills, Plymouth, Mass.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., January 20, 1909.

MESSRS. HARDING, WHITMAN & CO., Boston, Mass.

MR. WM. WHITMAN.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 14th received and noted. In reply please find inclosed four samples of our cloth, two light and two heavy weights. On sample marked No. 1 we require 13½ ounces of yarn and the cloth finishes 12½ ounces. On sample marked No. 2 we require 15 ounces of stock and the cloth weighs 13½ ounces. On sample marked No. 3 we require 18½ ounces of stock and the cloth weighs 17 ounces. On the sample marked No. 4 we require 18½ ounces of stock and the cloth weighs 17 ounces.

These samples represent the various kinds of yarn which we use in largest quantities, and we hope they will give you the information you desire.

Yours, truly,

THE STANDISH WORSTED COMPANY,
E. H. DOW.

DUNN WORSTED MILLS,
Woonsocket, R. I., January 18, 1909.

MR. WILLIAM WHITMAN,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 14th received during writer's absence, hence the delay in answering same. Under separate cover we are mailing you samples of cloth made from XXXX grade, XXX grade, and PX grade. We do not make a cloth from grade similar to Prime. These goods we have made for some length of time, and writer has gone over our figures very carefully and finds that they average as follows: XXXX stock averages 1.10 pounds of worsted yarn to make 1 pound of worsted cloth. XXX stock averages 1.113 of worsted yarn to make 1

pound of worsted goods. PX stock averages 1.16 pounds of worsted yarn to make 1 pound of worsted goods. We trust this information will be satisfactory to you.

Yours, very truly,

DUNN WORSTED MILLS,
E. L. DUNN, Treasurer.

BROWN & ADAMS,
Boston, January 13, 1909.

WILLIAM WHITMAN, Esq.,
President National Association of Wool Manufacturers,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: In response to your question as to the shrinkages of foreign wools we beg to reply that, based on our experience as wool merchants, covering a long period of years, it is our belief that by far the larger proportion of the foreign wools grown of merino blood will shrink on the average over 56 per cent. To be more specific, would say that the Australian fine wools as a class will shrink all the way from 45 per cent to 65 per cent. Wools from the Cape of Good Hope, the shrinkage is from 55 to 75 per cent. From South America, from 50 to 72 per cent. The Spanish wools will average around 64 per cent, the French wools around 65 per cent, and the German wools around 65 per cent.

Very truly, yours,

BROWN & ADAMS.

THE BUSTED RAG TRUST.

MR. WARREN. Mr. President, we were informed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] that there was a rag trust. I have some information here—I think some of it comes from the same newspaper from which the Senator quoted—and while this information may differ from his, I do not think it will differ very much, as it looks as though it were more a "rag bust" than a rag trust. I submit it, however, and ask that it may be printed. It is not long, only two or three small items and a couple of letters.

MR. DOLLIVER. I have no objection to its being printed. It appears that this American United Woolen By-Products Company is in the hands of receivers. I learn that it went into the receivers' hands not on account of its failure to succeed in business, but because of a controversy as to who should be the president of it, the original organizer claiming that they ought not to move him out because he had introduced the rest of them to a very good thing. [Laughter.]

MR. WARREN. As this relates to the general subject of trusts and we are anxious to get all the information we can regarding them, and as there is not much of it, I ask that this matter may go into the RECORD. It is a most formidable trust. It claims to owe as much as \$13,634 and to have assets amounting to approximately \$8,000.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BUSINESS TROUBLES—NEW YORK—THE UNITED WOOLEN BY-PRODUCTS COMPANY.

[From the Daily Trade Record, May 21, 1909.]

Following an unrecorded assignment made by the company to Samuel S. Levor, associated with the F. B. Q. Clothing Company for the benefit of creditors, an involuntary petition in bankruptcy was filed yesterday against the United Woolen By-Products Company, of 35 Vestry street. The petition was filed by Collins, Wells & Hughes for these creditors: Hays, Levi & Co., \$279; The Washington Clothing Company, \$275, and The Fechheimer-Fishel Company, \$286. It was alleged that the company made an assignment on May 19 and admitted in writing its inability to pay its debts.

When it became known yesterday morning that the stockholders of the company had agreed to an assignment being made at a meeting the evening before, the bankruptcy petition was anticipated. As stated yesterday, a sheriff went into the place on Tuesday on a judgment for electrical work. The liabilities of the company are \$13,634 and the assets approximately \$8,000.

[From the Commercial Bulletin, May 22, 1909.]

It is reported that at a meeting of the creditors of the United Woolen By-Products Company, of New York, held some days ago, resolutions were adopted to call a meeting this week for the purpose of making a general assignment of the business for the benefit of the creditors. The liabilities of the company are said to be more than \$13,500, while the value of the stock on hand is estimated at \$8,000.

UNITED WOOLEN BY-PRODUCTS COMPANY.

[From the Commercial Bulletin, May 29, 1909.]

Every little while the clothing manufacturers of the country are approached by some "wise guy," who tells them that they are being unmercifully robbed by the dealer in woolen rags, that they are not receiving what they should from the dealers for their clips and that the only sure "get-rich-quick" method of disposing of their new clips is to form a combination with other clothing manufacturers and sell through a concern to be formed by themselves, thus eliminating the wholesale dealer, and thereby reaping the enormous profits that should rightfully go to them. The scheme has been tried time and time again, but never with success. The latest concern in this line to fall was the United Woolen By-Products Company, of 25 Vestry street, New York, a petition in bankruptcy having been filed against them by the following creditors: Hays, Levi & Co., \$279; Washington Clothing Company, \$275; and Fechheimer-Fishel Company, \$286.

The following is what the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin has to say about them:

"It was alleged that the company is insolvent, on May 19 made an assignment, and admitted in writing inability to pay its debts and willingness to be adjudged bankrupt. Deputy Sheriff Porges had already made a levy on the assets under an execution of \$271 in favor of the Charles A. Borne Company, and put a keeper in the place of business."

The company was incorporated on December 27, 1907, with a capital stock of \$3,000,000, and great things were expected of the new concern,

which sought to revolutionize the business in this line. The original plan was to form an association of clothing and cloak manufacturers, take from them their woolen clippings, and disposing of them to shoddy and paper manufacturers. Stock of the corporation was to be given to the members in payment for clippings up to July 1, 1908, after which cash was to be paid for the clippings.

The business depression following the panic of 1907, it is said, operated against the venture; there was a lack of cash capital, dissensions arose among those interested in the corporation regarding the policy of the business, and various changes took place among the company. Since the start there have been four presidents, the last one, Joseph I. Klatz, having taken charge about three weeks ago. Meetings have recently been held to devise plans to pay off the claims of creditors and liquidate the assets, and it was finally decided to make an assignment for the benefit of all the creditors.

NEW YORK CITY, June 9, 1909.

MR. WINTHROP L. MARVIN.

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received your telegram to-day, as follows:

"Can you ascertain and send to me the capitalization, volume of business, and other important details of United Woolen By-Products Company, referred to by our enemies in Congress as a gigantic trust?"

To which I sent the following reply:

"Telegram received. New York corporation. Capital stock, \$3,000,000. Will send further details."

Since sending above, which I confirm, I have learned that this so-called "trust" is now in bankruptcy. I inclose clipping from the Daily Trade Record of May 21. This is the same \$3,000,000 company referred to in my telegram. I verified this by later reports in the papers.

Yours, very truly,

MALCOLM D. WHITMAN.

S. RAWITZER & Co. (Incorporated),

Rawitser, N. Y., June 9, 1909.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read in this evening's paper that the question of a rag trust has come before you. To enlighten you about the so-called "United By-Products Company," would say that a concern under that name was formed about two years ago, simply combining a lot of clothing house people, who wanted to dispose of their own cuttings, perhaps with the idea that they could do so to better advantage. I would also say that it was merely a small affair and the concern has since gone into the hands of a receiver. I give you this information, not because I am looking for any advertising, but because I think it may be well for you to know.

Respectfully, yours,

S. RAWITZER & Co. (Incorporated),
H. RAWITZER, Treasurer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

THE SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 380.

MR. DOLLIVER. I desire to ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which paragraph 365 was adopted, for the purpose of offering the last amendment which I intend to offer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which paragraph 365 was agreed to. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered.

MR. DOLLIVER. I send the amendment which I offer to the Secretary's desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

THE SECRETARY. On page 128, it is proposed to strike out paragraph 365, from line 9 to line 11, inclusive, and to insert:

365. The duty upon all wools and hair of the first and second classes shall be based upon the shrinkage which would result in scouring such wools, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; if shrinking 65 per cent or more, 11 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 65 per cent and not more than 55 per cent, 13 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 55 per cent and not more than 45 per cent, 16 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 45 per cent and not more than 35 per cent, 20 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 35 per cent and not more than 25 per cent, 24 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 25 per cent and not more than 15 per cent, 27 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 15 per cent, 33 cents per pound.

MR. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether that amendment makes a reduction of the rates as found in paragraph 365 of the bill?

MR. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, the paragraph for which this amendment is offered as a substitute contains a specific assessment of 11 cents a pound on first-class wools and of 12 cents a pound on second-class wools, without any regard to their shrinkage. As I have previously shown, in the case of wools of a very large shrinkage that makes a very great assessment. For example, if the shrinkage is 70 per cent, a man who brings in 100 pounds of that wool, after his scouring process is over, finds himself with only 30 pounds of wool upon which he has paid 11 cents, which indicates that he has paid on the scoured contents of his cargo 36½ cents a pound, whereas if the wool shrinks, for example, 20 per cent, his duty paid upon the scoured contents of the fleece is only 15 cents a pound. So, with this fixed specific on wools without any regard to their shrinkage, we have that tremendous variation by which the man importing low-shrinkage wools gets them in at a very exorbitant rate.

I have undertaken to state these duties. This is keeping them specific, but making them proportional to the shrinkage and, as near as may be, corresponding to the equivalent for each shrinkage to the duty assessed in this Senate bill. I would not be surprised, however, if this stimulated a little the duties upon wool. Some of them have been very low.

My own interpretation of the wool statistics of the United States is that our brethren who are raising sheep have been in the enjoyment of an imaginary protection for a good many years. Otherwise, it would be hard to account for the slow progress of wool husbandry in America; otherwise, it would be hard to account for the gradual disappearance of the sheepfold from the farms of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and my own State; otherwise, it would be difficult to understand why, in a climate as cold as that of the United States, the production of wool is, for practical purposes, at a standstill and the clothing of the people gradually taking the direction of cheap substitutes for wool, which are neither an improvement upon its quality nor upon its beauty.

MR. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

MR. DOLLIVER. Yes.

MR. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that an examination of the statistics would show that the wool production here has not stood still, but that it has always gone up rapidly under proper legislation, and that it has always gone down rapidly under improper legislation. When you can lose in the space of seven years one-half, or nearly so, of the production of wool, it takes some time to get back to where you were when you started on the downward grade.

MR. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, there have been no variations in the progress of sheep husbandry in the United States; but the thing which impressed me in studying the statistics was that this production of wool has been hanging around 300,000,000 pounds annually for a good many years, practically for a whole generation, and I feel that there must be something wrong in the situation, which in a country of such enterprise as ours has left the statistics of wool production in such a shape as that.

During my recent discourse on this subject the Senator from Wyoming kindly called my attention to the fact that the wools of the second class, bearing a duty of but 12 cents a pound when washed, constitute only a small part of our total importations of wool. I find, however—if I may have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming—that at the present time such wools arriving in our ports have reached 2,000,000 pounds per month, which, if continued at that rate for a year, would amount to 24,000,000 pounds, upon which the worsted spinners and weavers would save during the year, on 12 cents a pound duty, the amount of \$2,500,000.

MR. WARREN. If the Senator were a shepherd and knew of the habits of the sheep, of course he would understand that just at present this country is receiving wool as it is sheared abroad. This is soon after the shearing season of most countries, and the average, which has been less perhaps than 12,000,000 pounds per year, will probably be struck before the end of the present year. The main portion of the wool comes in immediately after shearing.

MR. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I intend to put in some place in some of these little discourses a statistical table giving the origin of these imports; and while it is true that it is now getting past shearing time here [laughter], there are antipodes on this earth where shearing time comes in another portion of the year, and on that other side of the world a good deal of wool business is being transacted, if I am correctly informed.

The thing about that business that bothers me most is that this steady stream of second-class wool coming in here at a scoured duty of 15 cents a pound is the exact wool that is in conflict and competition with the wools of my own State and the States of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and a number of our Middle Western States.

MR. WARREN. But you do not raise much wool in Iowa, do you?

MR. DOLLIVER. We are not raising very much now, because we find here a little automatic mechanism that was devised in 1867, by which a man looking for this particular kind of wool, if he finds the price of it going up 1 cent above the London price plus 15 cents that would have to be paid for the scoured duty upon it, turns away from us and seeks his profit in dealing with the foreign market. So I have felt a deep interest

in this subject, and every time my friend from Wyoming has become so excited about noils and about cheap wastes and about roving wastes and slubbing wastes and ring wastes, and is kind enough to tell the people that they are more important than second-class wool, I made up my mind that when I got a chance to do so I would give my friend from Wyoming an opportunity to help me consolidate these two classes of wool. It will not hurt anybody, as the amount is negligible, according to his own statement. Let us consolidate them, and do away with this little peculiarity that crept into our statutes so many years ago.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's State is one of the most beautiful that I know of. I have to pass through it from end to end very often during every year; and as I see such beautiful sheep among the pastures, I ask, Is the Senator quite sure that they grow second-class wool?

Mr. DOLLIVER. They look like English mutton sheep to me; most of them.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; but English mutton sheep is not a long-wool or a second-class wool sheep, but happens to be a short-wool sheep, and the wool the Senator speaks of is very largely Southdown and similar grades.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The reason that I think that these sheep of ours are No. 2 is the fact that they seem to be a diminishing quantity, passing off the scene of action like the carded woolen industry of Provo and Philadelphia.

Mr. WARREN. Well, the Senator's State is so productive in corn and other products that it becomes impossible for the poor and humble sheep herder to raise sheep.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Examination of the amendments which I offer must soon convince any fair-minded man that I propose no such radical change in the tariff rates upon either wool or woolen goods as might injure any domestic industry, or which should offer any excuse for lowering the wages of any operatives in our mills. Nor will anything be found in these amendments that can possibly justify the statement that I am engaged in an attempt to pull down that ancient "citadel of protection," the "wool schedule," or that I stand in anything like the same position as those Democrats who favored free wool, and who put wool upon the free list of the Wilson-Gorman bill. On the contrary, I shall show that I am a fairer and more consistent protectionist than those who have so criticized me, for my amendments are drawn, not to excessively protect a small coterie of worsted top and yarn spinners and weavers, but to better and more equally protect all interests, from the woolgrower to the consumer; though by such proper readjustment and equalization of tariff rates it is possible that the excessive profits of the worsted combination (due to a large extent to the discriminations in their favor because of the inequalities of Schedule K) may be slightly reduced. In any event, I believe it to be the duty of this Congress to so readjust and equalize the rates of duty on wool and woolen goods that they shall no longer discriminate in favor of one branch of the industry to the detriment of any other, or benefit a favored few at the expense of the many.

As the foundation of the Woolen Schedule K rests upon the classifications and rates of duty on the various kinds of wool, I have endeavored, and I believe succeeded, in working out a new arrangement for equalizing the duties upon wools of the first and second classes, according to their shrinkages, which will result in strengthening the "citadel's" foundation and give greater protection to the woolgrower; or at least give him the protection he has been misled into believing he is now receiving, but which he is not receiving, because of the peculiar provisions of the present and former tariffs fixing a duty of 11 cents per pound on unwashed wools of the first class, and only 12 cents per pound on washed wools of the second class, regardless of their value or shrinkage.

This arbitrary and manifestly unfair and unequal method of assessing the wool duties has operated to deceive the woolgrowers, and to discriminate against the carded woolen manufacturers using high-shrinking wools of the first class, and has greatly favored the worsted spinners, top makers, and weavers, who import most of the light-shrinking wools of the first class, and nearly all the washed wools of the second class, upon which the saving in duties is very great because of their light shrinkage and the consequent amount of clear wool recovered in scouring.

While the tariff provides that "wool imported in the scoured condition shall pay three times the duty on unwashed wool," the woolgrowers should be no longer deceived into believing they

derive any benefit by reason of this provision, for no wools are imported in the scoured condition. For why should the worsted manufacturer import his wool in the scoured condition and pay a duty of 33 cents per pound thereon, when he can import wools which will shrink less than 50 per cent in scouring at 11 cents per pound, equal to only 22 cents per scoured pound? As a matter of fact, most of the wool imported by the worsted manufacturers shrink less than 50 per cent in scouring, while the duty per scoured pound on wool of the second class, shrinking but 20 per cent, would amount to but 15 cents. On the other hand, the carded woolen manufacturers are practically debarred from importing their high shrinking wools, as the 11-cent per pound rate on wools such as they use, shrinking, say, 65 per cent in scouring, would amount to 31 cents per scoured pound, or to 33 cents per pound on such wool shrinking 66 per cent, the shrinkage on which the present scoured rate of three times 11 cents is based.

During my recent discourse on this subject the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] kindly called my attention to the fact that wools of the second class, bearing a duty of only 12 cents per pound when washed, constituted but a small part of our total importations of wools. I find, however, that at the present time such wool is arriving at our ports at the rate of about 2,000,000 pounds per month, and if continued at this rate for a year would amount to 24,000,000 pounds, upon which the worsted spinners and weavers would save 10 or 12 cents per pound duty, or about \$2,500,000 per year; a neat little saving, to be divided among a few needy New England gentlemen at the expense of the domestic woolgrowers, particularly of Virginia, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, and other States where wool of this class is most largely grown, for these 24,000,000 pounds of imported wool of class 2 would take the place of at least twice the amount of the heavy shrinking domestic wools, and also operate to depress the prices of our own wools.

It is therefore proposed to readjust the rates upon all wools of the first and second classes in a manner that will make the duty as nearly uniform and equal as possible to all users. There are three ways this can be accomplished. First, by the adoption of an ad valorem rate, which would bear uniformly on all grades or values of wools. Second, a compound rate of, say, 4 or 5 cents per pound and the rest ad valorem, the specific rate tending to steady the protective feature and the ad valorem to equalize the duties. Third, an arrangement of duties based on the various percentages of shrinkage in scouring or upon the scoured contents. It is this last method that I have adopted in the proposed amendment, using the present rate of 11 cents per pound as the basis for such wools having a shrinkage of 65 per cent or more, and increasing the rate for each 10 per cent less shrinkage, until the completely scoured stage is reached, when the duty will remain as at present, viz, 33 cents per pound. Analysis of this carefully prepared arrangement of progressive rates, according to shrinkage, shows that the average duties on all classes of wool will be as nearly the equivalent of the present "scoured rate" of 33 cents per pound as can be arrived at through the adoption of specific rates.

	Cents.
Shrinking 66 per cent, at 11 cents per pound.....	33
Shrinking 60 per cent, at 13 cents per pound.....	32½
Shrinking 50 per cent, at 16 cents per pound.....	32
Shrinking 40 per cent, at 20 cents per pound.....	33
Shrinking 30 per cent, at 23 cents per pound.....	32½
Shrinking 20 per cent, at 26 cents per pound.....	32½
Shrinking 10 per cent, at 30 cents per pound.....	33
Shrinking less than 5 per cent, at 33 cents per pound.....	33

Under the present tariff the duties on wools of the first and second classes are as follows, according to the shrinkage of the wools in scouring:

	Cents.
First class, at 11 cents per pound:	
Shrinking 30 per cent.....	14
Shrinking 35 per cent.....	16
Shrinking 40 per cent.....	18
Shrinking 45 per cent.....	20
Shrinking 50 per cent.....	22
Second class, at 12 cents per pound:	
Shrinking 15 per cent.....	14
Shrinking 20 per cent.....	15
Shrinking 25 per cent.....	16

The proposed method of fixing the duties upon wools according to their shrinkage is merely for the purpose of more properly equalizing the duties and making effective the theory upon which the duty on scoured wools have been assessed for so long, viz: That imported wools shrink 66 per cent in scouring, and therefore the duty on scoured wools should be three times the duty of 11 cents per pound on unwashed wools, or 33 cents per scoured pound. As it is clear that all wools do not shrink the same, it is necessary, in order to make this theory effective, giving the woolgrowers the "scoured" wool protection he be-

lieves he is getting, and to properly equalize the rates so that all the woolen and worsted manufacturers shall be on the same basis as far as their customs duties are concerned, to readjust these duties in some such manner as I have proposed. I do not claim that the plan I have proposed is perfect. It will not operate as uniformly and fairly on all grades and values of wools as an ad valorem rate; but it is a far better and more equal arrangement of duties than the present system and will prove fairer to all interests. While it is subject to the same criticism as all those provisions in our tariff based upon dividing lines of values, or "percentages of contents," it is no more objectionable than the other similar provisions to which I have alluded, and it does possess the great advantage over the present system of greatly eliminating the inequalities and discriminations we now so thoroughly understand exist in the application of one specific rate of duty to an article of wide range of values.

There certainly is no other article in our tariff schedules of such general and necessary use as wool or which has such a wide range of values that is afflicted with but one specific rate of duty, regardless of its value or the amount of dirt it contains, and so forth. On all other articles in our tariff that enter into general use and where the range of values is as wide as upon wool, some method is adopted to properly equalize the duties, either by the adoption of ad valorem duties, which is the fairest method in such cases, or by the use of compound rates, or by fixing the duty upon the actual useful contents that may be recovered, as in the case of zinc, lead, or antimony ores; and surely it is time that our tariff experts should be able to devise some scheme or plan to properly readjust and equalize the duties in this ancient woolen schedule, which has been practically unchanged for forty years. It is not a question how well adapted this schedule may have been to all concerned when it was originally devised in 1867. All conditions in the woolen trade and in woolgrowing have greatly changed in the past forty years. In 1867 we produced about 81 per cent of the wool we consumed and imported but about 19 per cent. In 1868 we produced about 89 per cent and imported but about 11 per cent. In 1907, however, see the change that has taken place, for we produced but about 60 per cent and imported 40 per cent. In 1867, when the compensatory scheme of 4 pounds of wool to 1 pound of cloth was agreed upon, our woolen cloths were very different in character from the present worsted and cotton light-weight mixtures. They were then "all wool and a yard wide."

In fact, "worsted" cloths were unknown at that time. It is clear, therefore, that we must so revise this old woolen schedule and bring it up to date by equalizing its rates properly to fit changed conditions, as we have done with all the other schedules in our tariff many times during the past forty years, for otherwise we shall starve the great carded woolen industry in its efforts to receive its necessary raw materials at reasonable prices. And this carded woolen industry is one that I believe is more worthy of protecting than the worsted industry, in whose favor the present schedules discriminate, for the carded woolen mills largely outnumber the worsted mills; they are scattered all over the country, and employ more operatives at better wages; their capitalization, however, is somewhat less, and their production less than the worsted interests, as they are in no combination.

Now, Mr. President, the effect of the amendment which I have offered is to consolidate these two classes of wool to a state of duties not in the crude terms of other generations, but in the carefully adjusted scheme of proportionate specifics, based upon the shrinkage of the wool, so that there will be a perfect equalization of the burdens of the wool tariff as they fall upon all departments of the woolen industry, giving to each one his fair share of the burden, and incidentally operating to lift up those who have fallen down and to offer to a great American industry a consolation which it appears from their own statement they were not able to secure within the hospitable doors of our Finance Committee.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Iowa has referred two or three times to the sheep in Pennsylvania. I observe from the bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers that there are 950,000 sheep of shearing age in Pennsylvania as of April 1, 1908.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What is the shearing age of sheep in Pennsylvania? [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. I do not know. I know of my own knowledge that the bulk of these sheep are raised in two counties in the western part of the State. I have heard directly from those

two counties, and they have urged me to support Schedule K as it stands reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has alluded to West Virginia several times. I am very glad that he has fond recollections of his early boyhood days that he passed in West Virginia and has not forgotten us. I find that we have 525,000 sheep in West Virginia, and the wool is classed 75 per cent fine. If any set of woolgrowers would be affected by this particular schedule, it certainly would be ours, and yet our people are asking me to do everything I can in order to secure the passage of Schedule K at the rates as they are now in the bill.

The flocks in West Virginia, as the Senator from Iowa knows, are owned by small farmers, who only have from 40 to 60 head of sheep each. They sell the wool, and probably realize \$100 or \$125 for the entire clip of the wool for one year. During the year they usually go to the country store at the crossroads or close towns and there run what we call a "store bill," for groceries and for their children's clothing and shoes, and so forth, and they agree to pay for the bills of goods when they sell their wool. I am sure the Senator wants to help me protect those old friends of his in West Virginia who are carrying on this industry in a modest way, for there are no large herds of sheep in West Virginia like they have in the Western States.

Mr. A. R. Jacobs, of Clinton, W. Va., probably one of the best posted men on sheep and wool industry in our State, gives the following cost of growing an average pound of wool of what is known as "Ohio," "Pennsylvania," and "West Virginia" wools. This statement he made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House:

Pasturing 100 head of sheep 7½ months, at 8 cents per head per month.....	\$60.00
Feeding 100 head of sheep 4½ months, one-half bushel corn and oats mixed per day, at 30 cents, for 30 days.....	40.50
Feeding 100 head of sheep 4½ months, 8 tons of hay, at \$8 per ton on the farm.....	64.00
Washing 100 head of sheep.....	2.00
Shearing 100 head of sheep, at 7 cents per head.....	7.00
Labor attending to the same sheep.....	25.00
Total.....	198.50
Wool from 100 average sheep shearing 5½ pounds, at 30 cents per pound.....	165.00
We can keep a flock of about 500 average sheep on one of our best 350 to 400 acre farms.	
Cost of keeping 100 head, \$198.50, or 500 head.....	\$992.50
Wool from 100 head, \$165; from 500 head.....	825.00
Fertilizer from sheds and droppings.....	10.00
Sale of increase of stock.....	300.00
Total.....	1,225.00
Extra feed and care rearing lambs.....	35.00
	1,190.00
Cost of keeping 500 head.....	992.50
Profit.....	198.50

From this, Mr. President, you can see that the profit in the woolgrowing industry is very meager indeed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What class of wool are those people raising?

Mr. SCOTT. Wool that is 75 per cent fine.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What class? Class 1 or 2?

Mr. SCOTT. The very best that is grown.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What class? The worst class is taxed the most. The duty on No. 1 is 11 cents and the duty on No. 2 is 12 cents.

Mr. SCOTT. We are willing to stand in the 11-cent class, I will say to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BRIGGS (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). As already announced, I am regularly paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], but by the arrangement which has been heretofore made he stands paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], which leaves me at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the negative). I desire to ask if the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. CURTIS. Then I desire to withdraw my vote, and announce my pair with that Senator.

Mr. DEPEW. I wish to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], and therefore I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	Gore	Newlands
Bankhead	Clay	Hughes	Overman
Beveridge	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Bristow	Davis	La Follette	
Brown	Dolliver	Martin	
Burkett	Fletcher	Nelson	

NAYS—37.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Root
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brandegee	Cullom	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Elkins	Penrose	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—33.

Bailey	Foster	Nixon	Smith, S. C.
Bourne	Frazier	Owen	Stone
Briggs	Frye	Paynter	Tallaferro
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Piles	Taylor
Culberson	Hale	Rayner	Tillman
Curtis	McCumber	Richardson	Wetmore
Daniel	McEnery	Shively	
Depew	McLaurin	Smith, Md.	
Flint	Money	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

The hour of 5.30 o'clock having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BULKELEY. I desire to introduce an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Overman
Bacon	Clay	Frye	Page
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Culberson	Gore	Root
Brandegee	Cullom	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Bristow	Curtis	Jones	Smoot
Brown	Davis	Kean	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Depew	La Follette	Stone
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Dolliver	McEnery	Warren
Burton	du Pont	McLaurin	Wetmore
Carter	Elkins	Martin	
Chamberlain	Fletcher	Nelson	
Clapp	Flint	Oliver	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on paragraph 380.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, at this time I want to place in the RECORD some statements which shall give a concise and

comprehensive view of the whole wool schedule, not only for my own ready reference, but for the benefit of those who have neither the time nor the inclination to go through the whole complex mass, the labyrinth of arguments presented on this schedule.

I want this statement to show just what protection the wool-grower is securing upon that which his labor produces, and just what added protection the manufacturer is receiving upon his output.

I want it to show, as nearly as can be shown, the cost of production of woolen fabrics abroad and the cost of producing the same character of fabrics at home.

Then I want it to show the ad valorem percentage of duties upon imports, and see how nearly those duties measure the added cost of production in this country.

I understand, as everyone understands, that in the nature of things there can be no specific duty that will operate with exact or equal justice upon every article of its class imported. It could only so operate when goods of only one value enter into the imports. If, therefore, you should take the cheapest piece of goods manufactured of a particular class of goods and apply the specific duty, it would be excessively high. If you should take the highest valued product of the class, it would be excessively low. No better demonstration of that fact could be given than that which was brought out by the Senator from Iowa in presenting the lowest added value of goods by reason of mercerization, and the Senator from Massachusetts, who presented goods of the highest added value by mercerization.

The Senator from Iowa presented a concrete case where the few added threads of mercerization only added one-eighth of a cent per yard to the cost of the goods, while the duty for mercerized cloth is 1 cent per yard additional. The Senator from Massachusetts exhibited an article showing 12 cents added value for mercerization. The lowest extreme would show, as stated by the Senator from Iowa, a duty eight times higher than the added cost by mercerization, while the highest valued goods would show a duty only one-twelfth as much as the added cost.

Neither of these concrete cases represents any average, and is therefore an improper guide. Taking the goods whose value is added to by mercerization we find that of the great bulk the 1 cent additional duty is fairly compensatory.

The only duty that could work with exact justice upon all articles and which would furnish a basis to which you could apply the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad would be an ad valorem duty. Years of experience have demonstrated that the ad valorem duties are subject to greater inequalities by undervaluations and other injustices than the specific duties, and not only the enlightened judgment of this country, acquired through experience, but also that of every other country is leading toward the substitution of specific duties wherever possible.

To give a comprehensive view of the woolen importations and corresponding duties we must reduce to an average ad valorem in order that we may determine whether or not we are applying the proper measurement of duties in changing to the specific.

I shall take as a basis of my calculation the imports of wool for the year 1907. A glance at the table of importations will show that almost all of the wool product imported comes in under "Class 1, unwashed," "Class 3, unwashed on the skin," and "Class 3, washed and unwashed not on the skin." All other importations of wool are of such a negligible quantity that they need not be taken into consideration, as they would not influence to any appreciable extent the result of the deductions.

The following is a table showing the importations of wool for the year 1907 of the classes and kinds which I have mentioned, and I ask that this table be inserted as a part of my remarks:

1907.	Pounds.	Value.	Duties collected.	Ad valorem.
Class 1, unwashed.....	90,045,825	\$22,249,752	\$9,904,985	44.52
Class 3, unwashed on skin.....	1,836,804	206,159	55,104	26.73
Class 3, washed and unwashed not on skin.....	43,924,853	4,891,600	1,756,994	35.92
Total pounds imported.....	135,806,982			
Total value.....		27,347,571		
Total duties collected.....			11,717,083	
Average ad valorem.....				42.85

This per cent represents the average duty paid by the American manufacturer on the great bulk of all the wool imported which he manufactures into cloths, there being only a negligible

quantity of washed and scoured wool imported under the first class of wools and comparatively little under the second class of wools.

From estimates of imports and duties for the ensuing year reported by the Finance Committee, page 53, it will be found that the average ad valorem duty upon woolen goods described as—

	Per cent.
"Luxuries" is placed at	88.47
The average ad valorem duty on all other imported woolen goods is	45.85
The average ad valorem duty on all kinds is	67.16
Average ad valorem on the wools imported	45.85
Average ad valorem on manufactured goods in excess of average ad valorem on wools entering into them	24.21

The following estimates will show whether this average duty of 67.16 per cent is excessive or fair. The tables which were presented by me yesterday show that the average charge for labor in the United States is more than double the amount paid in Great Britain in the woolen-textile trade. Using this double cost of labor as a basis, and assuming that the labor represents 80 per cent of the cost of an article and the raw material 20 per cent of its cost, we will have this comparison:

Cost of production in Great Britain:	
Labor	\$0.80
Material	.20
Total	1.00
Add to this 67.16 per cent duty, the average under this bill	.67
Making the cost of the British article, when imported into this country	1.67
Cost of production in United States:	
Labor—double cost of British	1.60
Original cost of material	.20
Duty on material 42 per cent of 20 cents	.08
Total cost in the United States	1.88

As against British cost, with duties paid, \$1.67.

This would show a duty levied under this bill of about 21 per cent less than the difference between cost abroad and at home, if those two items alone made up the cost. This would have to be overcome with other advantages which might lessen the American cost of production.

But there are those who deny vigorously that the wage cost in the United States is double the wage cost in Great Britain or Germany. I believe that it is double. My belief is sustained by the comparative table of wages which I received the other day from the Department of Commerce and Labor and inserted in the RECORD. But assuming that it is not double, assuming that it is only 75 per cent higher in the United States—I do not think any Senator will say it is less than 75 per cent higher in the United States—taking the British cost of 80 cents would make the American cost \$1.40. Add to this the 20 cents original cost of material, plus 8 cents duty, and you would have \$1.68, which it costs the American manufacturer on the average as against the \$1.67 that it costs the British manufacturer to lay down the same goods in the port of New York, exclusive of very light ocean freight.

So, measured by that standard, if there were no other elements to be considered than that of the cost of the material and the cost of the labor, the average duty provided by this bill accurately measures within 1 cent the difference between the cost of production in Great Britain and the cost of production in the United States. In other words, we would now have the American cost of production, \$1.68, and the British cost, with the duty added, \$1.67.

This would make the duty levied practically represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad and place the American and the British merchant on about equal terms. Of course the American would have the further advantage resulting from closer proximity, both to the product entering into the manufactured article and to the field of consumption, and, it may be said, a further advantage in being able, with a given number of employees, to produce a greater quantity of manufactured fabrics. But, giving him these advantages, we only fairly fulfill the requirements that the tariff should represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, including a reasonable return upon investment in favor of the American producer.

Is the duty upon the wool itself too high for reasonable protection to the American farmer or woolgrower? I went into that subject the other day, and I think I showed conclusively that it was not too high; that we have not yet recouped the losses that we incurred during the time when it was lessened; that we had to almost go out of the business of sheep raising in my State.

Believing that the farmer's protection is not too high, we are then brought face to face with the question, Can we reduce

the manufacturer's protection without injuring the farmer? Every farmer in this country who raises sheep understands that the value of his product is always determined by the amount of wool raised in this country and the amount imported into this country. The less the imports the greater the demand for and the value of his wool product, and the greater the imports the less the demand and value.

Therefore, if we give the farmer adequate protection, so that, we will say, there is imported into this country only \$135,000,000 worth of wool, and if we take away the differential from the manufacturer, so that instead of importing wool he imports \$200,000,000 of woolen goods, does not the farmer suffer the same result as though we had lowered the tariff upon his own products and allowed more wool to come in?

In other words, if we introduce \$200,000,000 worth more of woolen goods, we introduce a proportionately greater amount of wool, which is in those goods, into the country and thereby depress the market for the American woolgrower. It is just as bad for the farmer whether the wool comes in raw or in woolen fabrics; there is just so much more wool in the country to depress the price.

Mr. President, it would be just as reasonable for me to stand here and insist that while the Senate should give the farmer a protection of 30 cents a bushel upon his wheat, at the same time we should take away the protection upon the flour and let the flour come in and take the place of his wheat. I certainly would fail very materially to perform my duty if I did not insist upon a duty on the flour which would be as much greater than that upon the wheat as will measure the difference between the value of the wheat and the value of the flour. I can not excuse myself in attempting to represent the farmer honestly and fairly if I excite his hope that I will keep out the Canadian wheat by reason of the 30-cent-per-bushel barrier and at the same time allow the Canadian wheat to come in in the shape of flour. What I have said with reference to wheat would also apply to the case of flax if I should cut off the duty upon linseed oil, the product of the flax.

What I wish to make clear to the Senate and to those farmers who may read any portion of these debates is that the farmer's protection depends upon the protection to both the raw wool and to the woolen textile trade in the United States. Not only from concrete reasoning upon the subject, but from past experiences, he can see that his product has gone up or gone down just in proportion as the prosperity of the manufacturer has gone up or down. Then taking these averages—and I have shown conclusively by the records that the average protection is only 67 per cent for the manufacturer and that he pays 42.85 per cent added cost for the wool that is imported and goes into his manufactured fabrics, over and above what he would pay if wool were free, and that the difference between the American cost and the British cost is such as to render it necessary to have that much of a spread between the tariff on the wool and the tariff on the cloth manufactured from it—I feel that I am protecting his interest only when I vote for a duty, on an average, I say, that will represent this difference between the cost of his manufactured article in the foreign country and in this country.

There may be some instances, Mr. President, in which on a particular article the duty in favor of the manufacturer may considerably more than measure this difference, and upon another particular article it may be considerably less than what will measure the difference in the cost.

It may be also true that the cost of production of one article in Great Britain may be almost as much as in the United States while in the production of another article it may be almost three times as much in the United States. But taking them all upon the principle of averages, and that is all we can do when we fix a bill upon specific duties, the average protection is not more than is necessary to measure the difference between the cost at home and abroad, and it is as necessary for the North Dakota producer of wool as it is for the producer of the fabric made out of that wool.

Mr. President, there is just one other thought in connection with this matter that I wish to present. There is no reason in the world why we should not produce in the United States all the wool that is necessary to manufacture in the United States the same as we produce all the wheat in the United States that is necessary to manufacture into the flour in the United States. Why do we not do it? We do not do it simply because the woolen industry has not paid. Whenever we can so protect the woolen industry, both the farmer and the manufacturer in the United States, that the woolen industry on the farm will pay more for the labor that is employed in it than the wheat produced by the same labor, the farmers will go into raising more sheep and less wheat, and the result will be that we will be

able to furnish all the wool that is necessary for use in this country.

Mr. President, we have had commissions appointed in the United States to look after the interests of the farmer and to devise ways and means of making the rural life so agreeable that the young men will not leave the farms and come to the city. Those are beautiful ideas, but they will never amount to anything. There is just one thing that will make farm life more attractive than any other, and that is to make it pay better. The question of dollars and cents is always the determining question which sends the boy to the farm or sends him into the city. The young man who gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning and starts to milk cows to bring milk into this city from his farm 5 miles distant, through mud and slush and in all kinds of weather, and gets back home again and completes his chores at 10 o'clock at night, and finds that he has just made a living, while an average clerk, working from 9 o'clock in the morning until half past 4 in the afternoon, is receiving from \$1,200 to \$1,400 per annum, naturally feels that he would prefer to come to the city.

Now, I want to make all of our farming industries so valuable, by needed protection and other assistance, that the farming interests will be as profitable for the same number of hours of labor per day as any other industry in the United States. When the young man on the farm, coming to town, finds that the merchant closes his store at 6 o'clock in the afternoon in these beautiful summer days and then takes his family in his automobile and gives them a ride through the country and brings them back to a beautiful home, he is naturally attracted into mercantile business. The only way to keep him at home is to demonstrate to him that the laws of this country will so assist his business that he will make as much upon the farm as in the city, that he can cease all his labors at 6 o'clock, and that his business will be just as profitable as that of the merchant in the city.

No other scheme on earth is going to keep him on the farm. Neither circulating libraries nor singing birds; nothing but prosperity will make farm life attractive.

I feel that I am assisting a little in that line in protecting his wool against the competition of wool raised by 5 cents per day labor in India, or 15 cents per day labor in South America, and protecting that wool whether it comes in competition with the wool fleece produced by that cheap labor, or the cheap wool fabrics produced by the cheaper labor. So far as I can secure it I want the benefit of the American for the product of the American farmer and the American woolgrower.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have been very much enlightened by the luminous discussion of the wool and woolen schedule during this afternoon.

I think we would have had a perfect flood of light upon this schedule if it were not for the conflicting statements and the contradictory theories advanced by the disinterested Senators on the other side. Those Senators have been engaged so long and so constantly in pulling the wool over the eyes of the people that I believe they have really gotten to woolgathering themselves.

The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] stated this afternoon that the production of sheep and the production of wool in the United States have always responded to favorable tariff legislation. A resolution from the manufacturers of Philadelphia, presented by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] this afternoon, stated that, owing to the protection vouchsafed to the growers of wool and the manufacturers, we have come to produce three-fourths of all the wool in the United States which is required for domestic production, and that the golden prosperity insured by protective tariff had brought about these beneficent results.

Mr. President, the only trouble I experience is that I have never been able to believe two statements that were absolutely contradictory. I have never been able to accept theories that were diametrically antagonistic to each other. But that occasions no trouble to a stand-pat protectionist. The fact that statements and arguments are contradictory to each other causes no perplexity to his luminous intellect.

The production of wool and of sheep in the United States either does respond to our tariff legislation, as alleged by the Senator from Wyoming this afternoon, or it does not. One or the other is certainly true.

I wish to present several questions to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], questions which must be answered before we can accept their theory that the production of sheep and wool responds to favorable tariff legislation.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] this afternoon propounded a very pertinent question to the Senators from

Wyoming and Montana. He asked why it was that we had in this country in 1903, 63,000,000 head of sheep, and two years later, in 1905, we had only 45,000,000 head of sheep. The Senator asked why it was that under a high-protective tariff the number of sheep in the United States diminished 18,000,000 in two years. The Senator from Georgia was entitled to a candid answer to his inquiry, and he received two answers. The Senator from Wyoming stated with great complacency that the returns for 1903 were "mere estimates"—"mere opinions"—a sort of uninspired guess. That is not the first time that statistics quoted from an official document have been whistled down the wind by a mere suggestion that they were the fancies of an enthusiast.

But, sir, that answer hardly convinced my judgment, and the senior Senator from Montana came to the rescue of his colleague. The Senator from Montana is the Oedipus of the Republican party, the only one who can solve the riddle of the sphinx, the only man who can reconcile irreconcilable statements, the only man who can extract the mote of truth from the mountain of error. This new Richmond came to the rescue, and what was his answer to that question? He said the reason why we had 18,000,000 more sheep in 1903 than we had in 1905 was because the European wool market was demoralized in 1902, in consequence of the Boer war of 1899.

Now, Mr. President, that is getting down to business. That is what a lawyer would call "the proximate cause." That answer struck me as having a great deal of force. It was extremely persuasive, to my judgment. The Senator was interrupted in the course of his lucid observations, and I was left to infer that the reason that the number of sheep decreased in the United States was this: The sheep in South Africa belonged to the International Peace Society; when the black clouds of war were lowering in that region they migrated to the United States; and later on, when that "cruel war was o'er," when the white-winged angel of peace and the black-winged angel of death hovered over the prostrate form of those stricken Republics, those sheep slowly and sorrowfully wended their way back to the green fields and the pleasant pastures; they trekked their way back to the verdant veldts of the once glorious Transvaal.

There was some confusion in the Senate, and I could not quite understand his reference to the demoralization of the wool market in Europe in 1902. The Senator assured us that wool was cheaper in Europe that year than it had ever been during the history of the trade, and the senior Senator from Utah set the seal of Solomon on the whole fairy tale by saying that wool was placed in bond in the custom-house in New York, I believe, for 10½ cents.

So, amid the confusion, I was driven to the conclusion that wool was so cheap in Europe and throughout the world that it stimulated the production of sheep in the United States. That was the reasoning of the Senator from Montana, and that was his conclusion.

That is not the only phenomenon connected with this response of wool and sheep and favorable tariff legislation in the United States. Here is another question I want those Senators to answer for the benefit of those who are unenlightened, like myself, and for the benefit of the Philadelphia woolen manufacturers. Those gentlemen, no doubt, have founded their conclusions upon supposed facts. They believe that the tariff really helps the growers of sheep, as well as the manufacturers of wool, and if they were convinced that it did not, they would change their theory and their views upon the tariff question. They are governed by what they believe is a scientific investigation of facts, and are not warped by their own sordid interests in the proposition.

I want the Senator from Wyoming when he next elaborates upon the response of sheep and wool to tariff legislation to tell the Senate why it was that in 1885 there were 50,000,000 head of sheep in the United States, and in 1890 there were only 44,000,000 head of sheep in the United States. The tariff had not varied one centime during that five years, and yet sheep had decreased 6,000,000 head in five years, more than 1,000,000 head per year. Was that in response to favorable tariff legislation?

Not only that, but from 1890 to 1895, during the terrible panic, sheep decreased from 44,000,000 to 42,000,000 head, a decrease of 2,000,000 during those five years, whereas there had been a decrease of 6,000,000 head during the previous five years.

Now, there had been unfavorable tariff legislation during the meantime, and yet sheep had not decreased in number one-half so much under the unfavorable legislation during that five years as they had decreased during the preceding five years under favorable legislation. I want the Senator from Wyoming to tell the Senate why that was when he again states with so

much eloquence and confidence that wool and sheep "respond to favorable tariff legislation."

I know just about what the Senator from Wyoming will say. I have heard him dilate so much upon the panic of 1893. He will say that during the years from 1885 to 1890 those sheep—

Dipped into the future far as sheepish eyes could see,
Saw a vision of the world and all the panics that should be.

Those sheep caught glimpses of the shadow, of the coming panic, and they instantaneously committed suicide. [Laughter.]

That is why the sheep decreased 6,000,000 from 1885 to 1890 under favorable legislation.

Well, you ask why the process did not go on with an increasing ratio. Eighteen hundred and ninety-three arrived, the panic actually burst upon the country, and the sheep of the country increased 3,000,000 head that year over the number we had the preceding year, the panic to the contrary notwithstanding. The sheep seemed to thrive on the panic and increased 3,000,000 head.

Now, why was that? Why, Mr. President, those sheep saw that the panic was already here. They consulted the stars. They cast a horoscope. They penetrated the future again, and they discovered that the Wilson-Gorman tariff law would not be enacted for fifteen months, and they stopped the process of self-destruction. You see, the sheep in this country have been close students of tariff schedules, and when the panic came in the spring of 1893 they knew that it was not due to the unfavorable tariff legislation in the Wilson bill, and which was not to supervene for fifteen months yet to come. You see, those sheep knew that the panic of 1893 was not due to the tariff act of 1894, but they deserve no credit for that conclusion. Any "mutton head" ought to know that, Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for that elegant phrase. [Laughter.] Anyone who knows that the cause must precede the effect knows that the panic of 1893 was not attributable to the tariff act of 1894.

But, Mr. President, there were more sheep in the United States in 1895, during the very heart of the panic, than there were in 1900, after the Dingley law had been enacted for three years, and during the very time that the Republican party declared in national platform that they had restored a prosperity more general and abounding than was ever known. Yet the sheep of 1900 did not equal by 1,000,000 the sheep of 1895.

Mr. President, I propose to be entirely fair, because I want those Senators to look the facts in the face. The number of sheep in this country did decrease from 1894 to 1897. There was a decrease of 8,000,000 head of sheep in the United States. During those four years there was a decrease equivalent to the decrease from 1885 to 1890; but, Mr. President, let me remind the Senators again that from 1903 to 1905 there was a decrease of 18,000,000 head of sheep in this country, according to the official report, and from 1893 to 1894, only one year, there was a decrease of 12,000,000 head of sheep.

Now, sir, during the entire operation of the Wilson tariff law, which placed wool on the free list, the number of sheep in the United States decreased 8,000,000 head, and yet during two years under the present Dingley law they decreased 18,000,000 head—more than twice as many—and during the one year from 1903 to 1904 they decreased 12,000,000 head, not quite twice as much as during the entire operation of the Wilson tariff law, which placed wool absolutely upon the free list.

But, Mr. President, that is not the only question that I want those Senators to answer who say that sheep and wool respond to "favorable tariff legislation." I want the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Wyoming to answer this one other question. I will not call upon the senior Senator from Utah to answer it. Of course he could answer it. That good-natured Senator has already demonstrated that he knows less about more things than any other Member of this body. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, when the eloquent Senator from Wyoming comes to explain how prosperity, how sheep and wool trailed along in the wake of favorable tariff legislation, I want him to go up against this question: In 1895, in the very heart and storm of the panic, we produced in this country 309,000,000 pounds of wool, more wool than was ever produced in one single year in the United States during our entire history up to that time. That was a larger production of wool than we have ever seen in the United States from the beginning of our Government until the present hour, except in 1902 and the estimates for 1908.

Now, let the Senator explain why, if the production of wool responds to tariff legislation, we produced more wool in 1895 than we ever did produce under high tariff prior to that time, or than we have ever produced under a high tariff since that time, except, as I have said, in 1902 and the estimates for 1908.

Not only did the number of sheep decrease 6,000,000 from 1885 to 1890 when the tariff was unchanged, but the production of wool decreased during the same five years 32,000,000 pounds; and during the next five years, the panic and unfavorable tariff legislation to the contrary notwithstanding, the production of wool in the United States increased 33,000,000 pounds. I have just a curiosity to know if wool responds to the tariff, why, under a free-wool tariff, production increased?

I know that facts do not weigh in the balance against these theories and perhaps it is an idle curiosity, but I want an answer.

Mr. WARREN. I have just come into the Chamber and I do not know whether I heard the Senator's figures correctly. In what year does he claim the high production occurred?

Mr. GORE. In 1895.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator know why it was higher in 1895?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; the panic was prevalent that year and the sheep were sorrowful; they had long faces and naturally grew more wool under those circumstances. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Whenever—

Mr. GORE. I suppose, Mr. President, that those figures were merely the estimate of an enthusiast, as the Senator said about the 63,000,000 sheep in 1903.

Mr. WARREN. I do not hear the Senator. Will he make that statement again, please?

Mr. GORE. Oh! The Senator said this afternoon that the high-water mark in the number of sheep in 1903, the statement that we had 63,000,000 of sheep, was a mere statement or estimate of an enthusiast. I say, probably that was the reason why we produced more wool in 1895.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator does not wish, I know, to quote me incorrectly. I did not say that.

Mr. GORE. I so understood the Senator. Of course, I may have misunderstood him. I am perfectly willing to leave it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. WARREN. Well, if the Senator will leave it there.

Mr. GORE. I am sorry the Senator was not in, because I had propounded several inquiries. There are, of course, good reasons why the production of wool was more in 1895.

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator like to have me answer that now?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. In that year there was the regular clip of the sheep, and added to that were the pelts and the wool of the sheep that were slaughtered by those who could no longer afford to hold them at the price that wool was bringing. It always follows; a slaughter of the animals of course increases the skins; and in the case of sheep it increases the wool for a time, as in this way there are practically two clips in one year from those slaughtered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that could not be.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will notice, or if he has the figures in his mind, and I dare say he has, he starts with 1895. Three hundred and nine million and some pounds was the production of wool. In 1896 we had but 272,000,000 pounds. As I said, the year before the law went into effect which disastrously affected sheep, in 1894, the clip increased by the addition of felts and pulled wool, as I have stated. The clip following that shows the fact that in 1896 we were down to 272,000,000 pounds, and in 1897 down to 259,000,000 pounds of wool.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that is merely another one of those fairy tales with which the disinterested Senators on the other side meet these arguments. I have but one objection to the Senator's answer and to the Senator's theory, and that is, that it is not true; and that is a tolerably serious objection to any argument except to a "standpatter."

Now, I will convince the Senator that he is wrong.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator mean that I have quoted wrong figures?

Mr. GORE. I mean your theory that it was dead sheep. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I quoted the figures of the United States census. I presume the Senator may know more than the United States officials do about those things.

Mr. GORE. No, sir; I am not at all pretentious, but I know more than to yield any credence to that fanciful theory advanced by the Senator from Wyoming, and I will convince every Senator here that it is not true and that it is not founded on facts. I allude not, of course, to the Senator's veracity, but to his theory. I believe that he imagines that that is true. Now, let us see. In 1890 we had 44,000,000 head of sheep. The

wool amounted to 276,000,000 pounds. In 1895 we had 42,000,000 head of sheep, and we cut 309,000,000 pounds of wool, and the year before that we only had 44,000,000 head of sheep. So the Senator gets 33,000,000 pounds of wool from 2,000,000 dead sheep. The dead ones must be far more prolific than the live ones. [Laughter.] Mr. President, the death rate amounted to only 2,000,000 between the two years.

If the Senator did not say that the sheep amounted to 63,000,000 in 1903 and sunk down in 1905 to 45,000,000, if he did not say that the former figures were the estimate of an enthusiast, I again propound to him the question to explain, if favorable tariff legislation influenced wool and sheep production, why it was that under the present high tariff the number diminished in the United States from 1903 to 1905 the enormous number of 18,000,000, and from 1903 to 1904, in one year, they decreased 12,000,000 head? I do not think I am in error as to those figures. When he or some one else has the leisure I should like to know why it was that the number of sheep decreased 12,000,000 head in one year, and that without any variation in the tariff? Of course, if the tariff had been changed, we could easily account for the diminution of wool and sheep according to his theory. It has occurred to me that possibly the reason that sheep declined from 1903 to 1904 12,000,000 head was that the sheep were apprehensive of Judge Parker's election and thought that the "strenuous one" would go to his Waterloo, and were simply hedging on that account. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as I stated, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's flow of oratory, but I know he does not want to misquote me. What I said to-day was that, counting the sheep had proceeded along for a time, counting not only all the sheep, but the lambs less than a year old. From the date which the Senator mentioned the mode of counting was changed so as to count only the adult sheep, and that makes the difference, as the Senator would have discovered if he had also followed out the amount of the wool clip for those years.

Mr. GORE. Let me understand the Senator. He says they counted all the sheep up to this time.

Mr. WARREN. I do not say that they counted them all the time. I say that the count to which the Senator refers was a count obtained from sources which gave the lambs with the sheep; but that a change was made, so that the lambs were not carried to the count of the sheep until later in the season. So it makes the difference of just what the lamb crop was at that particular time.

Mr. GORE. You only counted the grown sheep up to 1904 or 1905? Will the Senator state why that change was made?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator can see from the wool clip that you could hardly have an increase of that many sheep, and shear them, and still show a shortage; or, rather, you could not have quite so large a shortage as that and have it show directly the opposite in the wool product of that year.

Mr. GORE. I notice the variation of the clip was also very striking from 1902 to 1904 and 1905. I supposed they sheared the lambs in 1902, as the fleece that year was the largest in our history. It has never been equaled since; it had never been equaled before. That seems to sustain the idea that there was a pretty goodly number of sheep. We would offhand conclude that, if there was more wool, there were more sheep; but, of course, I do not undertake to combat all these theories trumped up to explain these figures. I am not swearing by any figures. I merely had the curiosity to know why it was. This baby sheep business, of course, will prove satisfactory to everybody; but the variations before that in the number of sheep is quite as hard to explain and will call for some other theory than this.

Mr. President, I do not know whether or not it ever occurred to these Senators to examine the quotations of cotton. Cotton is unprotected. I have seen cotton sell for less than 4 cents a pound. I have seen cotton vary in prosperous times from 6 cents to more than 12 cents a pound. Did it ever occur to Senators that the same economic conditions, that the same trade conditions which influence cotton, might possibly influence wool also? Is the great universal law of supply and demand limited to cotton alone, and is wool exempted from its operations? Do the laws of trade and commerce take cognizance of vegetable fiber and have no jurisdiction over animal fiber? The same conditions which explain the variations of the cotton market will explain the variations in the wool market. And cotton is unprotected. The cotton farmer does not lean upon the strong arm of the Government; he does not thrust his hand into the pocket of any other citizen in this country in order to compensate himself for his product; yet his fabric varies in the market, and wool and woolen fabrics vary in the market in almost equal

measure, and that is attributable to identically the same causes, to identically the same influences and conditions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, when I concluded what I had to say last night, I had arrived at a point in my argument where I wished to submit some amendments to Schedule K, but the lateness of the hour caused me to defer submitting them at that time. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] had already submitted amendments, which were pending, and had others which he desired to offer to complete the plan of changing Schedule K, hence I have deferred offering the amendments which I wished to submit to the Senate until the present time.

While seeking to accomplish generally the same purposes that the Senator from Iowa had in mind, my plan is somewhat different. I submit amendments, which begin with ad valorem duties on raw wool. I believe that to be, under all the circumstances, the best plan of amendment which can be made to this schedule; and, according to that plan, I have worked out 24 amendments which I wish to submit to the Senate.

I have said to the Senator from Rhode Island that I should like to submit these amendments en bloc, and with the indulgence of the Senate, asking for a vote upon all of the amendments at one time, because they are all a part of one scheme or plan of modification of Schedule K.

So I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have the several amendments read for the information of the Senate, after which I will briefly explain their purpose and effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amend paragraph 356 by striking out the word "three" in line 23, on page 124, and insert the word "two."

Amend paragraph 357 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

357. Class one, all wools not hereinafter included in class 2.

Strike out paragraph 358.

Amend paragraph 359 by striking out the word "three" in line 14, on page 125, and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Amend paragraph 361 by inserting after the word "duty" in line 9, on page 126, the words "as class one" and by striking out all of the balance of line 9 and all of line 10.

Amend paragraph 362 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Paragraph 362. The duty on wools of the first class shall be 45 per cent ad valorem.

Strike out all of paragraph 363.

Amend paragraph 364 by striking out all of line 9, on page 127, after the word "be," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Thirty-five per cent ad valorem;" also by striking out all of lines 10 to 20, inclusive, on said page 127.

Strike out all of paragraphs 365 and 366.

Strike out all of paragraph 367.

Amend the committee amendment to paragraph 368 by striking out the words "30 cents per pound" in line 10, on page 129, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 369 by striking out the words "25 cents per pound" in line 11, on page 129, and the words "20 cents per pound" in line 14, and inserting after the word section, in line 14, the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 370 by striking out all of line 15, on page 129, after the word "flocks" and all of line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 371 to read as follows: 371. Tops, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Amend paragraph 373 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "pound" on line 26, on page 129, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "55 per cent."

Amend paragraph 374 by striking out the words "or in part of wool" in line 9, on page 130, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value."

Also amend the paragraph by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "section," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "65 per cent ad valorem."

Strike out all of paragraphs 375, 376, 377, 378, and 379.

Amend paragraph 380 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description" in line 11, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 381 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description" in line 15, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 382 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 18, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 383 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 23, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 384 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in line 1, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 385 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 4, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 386 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 6, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 387 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "rugs," in line 11, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 388 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in lines 15 and 16, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The object of changing from specific to ad valorem duties in this schedule is not, so far as the raw wool is concerned, to lower the existing rates, but to impose a protective ad valorem duty upon the wools imported. The average rate of the present law reduced to an ad valorem basis is now a fraction less than 45 per cent. The actual result is that high-class wools coming into competition with wools in this country pay less than 45 per cent, while a lower grade of wools of classes 1 and 2 pay a much higher duty than 45 per cent. For instance, one shipment of wool having a shrinkage of 20 per cent and another shipment having a shrinkage of 80 per cent would pay the same amount of duty, while really the first shipment will contain four times as much wool as the second. By substituting an ad valorem duty duties will be paid upon the actual value of the wool regardless of the shrinkage or waste or dirt that may be in the same, and at the same time will better protect the woolgrowers of this country.

The theory of these amendments, carried through all of them, is that in all cases a compensating duty of 45 per cent ad valorem shall be imposed, whether the wool be imported raw or advanced in manufacture, and when wool is advanced in manufacture an additional ad valorem is imposed to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad in the manufactured state.

The purpose of the amendment to paragraph 356 is to divide the raw wool into two classes instead of three. Classes 1 and 2 under the Dingley law, as shown by Estimated Revenues, have practically the same value; and if the duty is to be placed on an ad valorem basis, there is no occasion for having more than one class to cover any of the wool described in classes 1 and 2 of the existing law.

The amendment to paragraph 357 puts into class 1 all wools now described in paragraphs 357 and 358 of the bill, and the class is described as being "all wools not hereinafter included in class 2."

Paragraph 358 is stricken out because the classification therein provided is thrown into class 1 and covered by the amendment to paragraph 357.

Paragraph 359 is proposed to be amended by striking out the word "three" and inserting the word "two," the only change being made in numbering the class, but leaving the description as it is in the bill.

Paragraph 360 is not changed in any way.

The amendment to paragraph 361 merely provides that the wool therein described shall be classified as Class 1, this for the reason that as before stated, classes 1 and 2 in the present bill are both thrown into Class 1.

The amendment to paragraph 362 strikes out all of the paragraph and inserts in lieu thereof a provision for a 45 per cent ad valorem duty upon all wool in Class 1. This 45 per cent as stated before is a little higher than the present duty paid upon wools in classes 1 and 2 when reduced to equivalent ad valorem. Its purpose is not to reduce the duties upon wools in this class, but to equalize them, maintaining them as a whole at as high a protective point as is provided in the recent law.

Paragraph 363 is stricken out because if an ad valorem basis is provided the 45 per cent duty will automatically adjust itself to washed and unwashed wools; that is to say, unwashed wool being less valuable than washed wool, when the 45 per cent duty is applied to it will pay a less rate of duty than the 45 per cent rate applied to washed wools.

The amendment to paragraph 364 imposes a duty for wools upon class 2 (under the present law class 3). The ad valorem duty proposed is 35 per cent, which is the average of the present specific rates reduced to equivalent ad valorem now imposed upon wools in this class.

Paragraph 365 is stricken out because fully covered by the proposed amendment to paragraph 362.

Paragraphs 366 and 367 are stricken out for the same reason.

The amendment to paragraph 368 changes the rate upon top waste and the other wastes therein designated from 30 cents per pound to 45 per cent ad valorem. It is thought that these wastes, being a by-product of manufacture, should not pay a higher duty than the raw wool.

The amendment to paragraph 369 and the duty therein imposed is for the same reasons as have been stated with reference to paragraph 368.

The amendment to paragraph 370 strikes out the specific duty of 10 cents per pound and inserts an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent ad valorem.

The statement made with reference to the amendment to paragraphs 368 and 369 apply to this amendment.

The amendment to paragraph 371 imposes an ad valorem duty upon tops of 50 per cent, 45 per cent for the wool and 5

per cent protective duty to cover difference in labor cost at home and abroad.

Paragraph 372 is not changed.

The amendment to paragraph 373 changes the duty upon yarns from specific duties to an ad valorem rate of 55 per cent. This rate is arrived at by allowing 45 per cent as a compensatory duty for the wool and 10 per cent ad valorem for the difference in the cost of manufacture between this country and abroad. In arriving at this 10 per cent for difference in cost of production it has been assumed that wages in this country are 100 per cent higher than abroad, and the 10 per cent ad valorem allowed upon the full value of the yarn gives a protective duty of 100 per cent upon the labor cost.

The amendment to paragraph 374 is in line 9, by striking out the words "or in part of wool" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value." This amendment is for the purpose of bringing within the provisions of Schedule K manufactures containing wool only if such manufacturers have as their component material wool of chief value.

The next amendment to this paragraph strikes out the specific duties and imposes a duty of 65 per cent ad valorem upon the manufactures of wool. Here, too, this 65 per cent is made up of a compensatory duty of 45 per cent upon the material, which I have shown is 65 per cent of the total value of the product; and 45 per cent upon the material is therefore equal to an ad valorem rate of 30 per cent upon the total value of the product. In addition, I have allowed 30 per cent of the total value as a protective duty to cover the difference in the cost of manufacture in this country and abroad, and, as I have already shown to the Senate, this 30 per cent protective duty goes upon the assumption that the wages in this country are 100 per cent higher than abroad, and the 30 per cent more than covers this difference in cost.

Paragraphs 375, 376, 377, 378, and 379 are stricken out, for the reason that the 65 per cent ad valorem duty provided in paragraph 374 will cover all of the products mentioned in these various sections and provide for all of them a compensatory duty of 45 per cent for the wool and 100 per cent upon the wage cost.

The amendments to paragraphs 380 to 388, inclusive, relate to carpets of various kinds and substitute for the specific duties proposed in the bill an ad valorem duty of 60 per cent.

Here, too, a compensatory duty of 45 per cent is provided for the wool and 100 per cent for the difference in the cost of production. To again explain how this is arrived at, it is assumed that 65 per cent of the value of these carpets is for the material, and 45 per cent ad valorem duty upon this 65 per cent gives 30 per cent. Therefore, a duty of 30 per cent upon the total value of the product is equal to a duty of 45 per cent upon the value of the material. The additional 30 per cent is to cover the difference in the cost of manufacture here and abroad, and this 30 per cent upon the total value gives a protective duty of 100 per cent upon the wage cost.

The effect of these amendments, if adopted, will be to impose ad valorem duties as follows:

	Per cent.
Upon wool of class 1	45
Upon wool of class 2	35
Upon tops	45
Upon yarn	55
Upon carpets	60
Upon all other manufactures of wool or having wool as component part of chief value	65

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I ask that the votes by which these various paragraphs were agreed to be reconsidered for the purpose of allowing these amendments to be offered and to be voted upon together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was my request, that by unanimous consent that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, I will just say generally that the plan contemplated by these amendments combines classes 1 and 2 in the first class and makes class 3 the second class. It applies an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent to what is now classes 1 and 2 of the Dingley law and an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent to what is now class 3 of the Dingley law. I speak now of the raw wool. That is a bit higher than the present ad valorem upon those classes.

Mr. President, I wish to send to the Secretary's desk and have read a letter which I received in my mail to-night from Mr. Edward Moir, the president of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE CARDED WOOLEN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 10, 1909.

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since early in the year, when tariff revision became the burning question of the hour, we, the carded woolen manufacturers of the country, have in numerous ways made known the changes that were necessary in the wool schedule in order that even-handed justice might be given the woolgrower, the carded-woolen manufacturer, the worsted spinner, and the consuming public.

Our latest appeal is in a letter to our Chief Executive, on whom will fall the burden of approving or rejecting the bill you are now at work upon. Thinking that this statement of our grievances may aid you to appreciate the importance and justice of our demands, we herewith present a copy of our letter to President Taft, where at considerable length we show the inequalities of the tariff schedule as affecting wool and wool goods, and strongly recommend an ad valorem duty on wool, so that a tax on grease and dirt, which are substantially all discounted in the price paid for wool, may be eliminated from the tariff.

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD MOIR, President.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. I simply want to know from the Senator if I understood him correctly as saying that the amendments proposed by him provide duties in excess of the existing Dingley rates?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no; I said that with respect to the rates upon raw wool the present rates, figured upon the imports, are a fraction less, as I make it, than 45 per cent. I fix the rates at an even 45 per cent in the amendments, which makes it a fraction more upon raw wool; but these duties, taken throughout the schedule as I have prepared them, applying ad valorem rates instead of the present specific rates as compensatory duties, make a reduction upon all of the manufactures of wool in conformity with the investigations made by the special agent, Mr. Clark, which I presented to the Senate last night.

Mr. CULBERSON. But as to raw wool, as I understand, the amendments propose rates slightly in advance of the Dingley rates?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A fraction of a per cent in advance. The amendments can not be objected to, Mr. President, as a reduction upon raw wool; and I might as well say it now as at any other time that if anybody is to be indulged by continuing Dingley rates it might as well be the one producer in this country who rarely gets any direct benefit from a protective tariff. Outside, perhaps, of the duties upon barley and the duties upon wool the agriculturist of this country can not be said to receive anything from the protective tariff except an indirect, roundabout benefit which he takes from feeding the people who are employed in the protected manufactures.

Mr. President, I propose to follow the letter of Mr. Moir with the letter which accompanied the communication which I received from him, which that association has addressed to the President of the United States. I ask that the Secretary read the appeal to the President by this association of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

CARDED WOOLEN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 2, 1909.

SIR: We appear before you to-day for the purpose of stating certain facts relating to the tariff on wool and wool products, in order that you may know of the serious burdens now resting on the carded woolen industry and on the consumer of wool goods.

A TARIFF ON GREASE AND DIRT.

Schedule K is the same in the Dingley law and in the Payne bill now before the Senate. Both provide for a specific duty of 11 cents and 12 cents a pound on wool in the grease. This is the first grievance to which we call your attention. Grease wool contains widely varying proportions of grease and dirt, which is washed out in the first process—scouring—and is of no value whatever to the wool manufacturer. This wool grease and dirt amounts in many cases to as much as 80 per cent of the grease weight of the wool, while on some light-shrinking grades it is much less, as low as 15 per cent.

From this you will understand how wide is the variation in the duty on clean wool. With a shrinkage of 80 per cent, a duty of 11 cents per grease pound is 55 cents per clean pound. With a shrinkage of 20 per cent, the same 11-cent duty on the grease weight is only 14 cents per clean pound. The result is that the light-shrinking lots of wool can be imported at a very low duty, while the tariff on the heavy-shrinking wools is so high that they can not be imported at all. An application of the Dingley tariff to 80,000,000 pounds of wool recently sold at auction at London, Liverpool, Melbourne, and Sydney showed that the ad valorem equivalent of the Dingley 11-cent duty on grease wool varied from 23 per cent to 733 per cent.

NURSING THE WORSTED TRUST.

The bulk of the wool suited for our branch of the industry, carded woolen manufacturing, is heavy shrinking, while the wool suited for the other branch of the industry, worsted manufacturing, is light

shrinking. The burden under which we are suffering arises from this fact, and hence our appeal to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, and now to you for relief from this injustice. The conditions we have described result not only in the oppression and ruin of the carded woolen industry, dotting the country with idle mills, but also in special privileges of immense value to the worsted-spinning industry, which is being rapidly concentrated into a few wealthy, prosperous, and powerful combinations.

A DELUSION AND A SHAM.

At the same time the wool grower is deprived of the protection contemplated by the Dingley tariff law. That law fixes the duty on scoured wool at three times the duty on unwashed grease wool; that is, at 33 cents a scoured pound for class 1 wool, and 36 cents a scoured pound for class 2 wool. This is on the assumption that it requires 3 pounds of grease wool to give 1 pound of scoured wool, and this assumption is further indicated by the Dingley and Payne provision for compensatory duties on goods, based on the ratio of 4 pounds of grease wool to 1 pound of finished cloth, allowing for a loss of 25 per cent in manufacturing.

This legal promise of 33 cents a pound to the woolgrower has proved in practice to be a delusion and a sham, for the law that gives the promise of such protection breaks it by allowing the importation of light shrinking wool at the 11-cent rate. The protection to the woolgrower is measured not by the Dingley duty of 33 cents a pound on scoured wool, but by the equivalent per second pound of the 11-cent duty on grease wool actually imported, which equivalent runs as low as 14 cents, and in practice rarely exceeds 20 cents. The average shrinkage of the grease wool imported during the past five years is 40 per cent, equal to a duty of 18.6 cents per scoured pound.

Thus under this present wool tariff the woolgrowers are deprived of the expected protection, the carded wool manufacturers are deprived of all access to the foreign wool suited to their requirements, while the worsted spinners enjoy valuable special privileges by being permitted to import the wool they require at a very low rate of duty per scoured pound.

WASHED WOOL PRIVILEGE FOR THE WORSTED SPINNER.

Besides the inequality to which we have just called your attention, there are other serious abuses in the Dingley tariff on wool. First, we will mention the provision by which wool of the first class, if washed on the sheep's back, is subjected to a double duty of 22 cents a pound, while wool of the second class, if so washed on the sheep's back, is admitted at the single rate of 12 cents a pound. The result is that all wool of the second class is imported in the washed condition in order to avoid the payment of duty on grease and dirt, while the very heavy wool of the first class can not be imported at all. The discrimination against one class of people and in favor of another under this arrangement of the tariff arises from the fact that the second-class wool is used for the manufacture of worsted, while the wool adapted for carded woolen goods is of the first class. We demand the abolition of this discrimination and special privilege under the law.

SCOURED WOOL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CARDED WOOLEN MANUFACTURERS.

Another inequality from which we ask relief is that provision of the Dingley and Payne bills which makes the duty on scoured wools three times the duty on grease wools. This is based on the assumption that 3 pounds of grease wool is required to yield 1 pound of scoured wool, whereas a very large part of the world's wool clip shrinks much less than two-thirds. The result of this inequality is to prohibit the importation of scoured wool and confine the imports to grease wool shrinking less than two-thirds. The discrimination against one class of people and in favor of another under this arrangement of the tariff arises from the fact that worsted spinners ordinarily buy wool in the grease, whereas scoured wools are used by the carded woolen manufacturers. Thus the scoured wool clause of the Dingley and Payne tariff bills constitutes a burdensome discrimination against the carded woolen manufacturers, from which we demand relief.

PARTS OF ONE INDUSTRY.

We desire to call your attention to the fact that the carded woolen and worsted branches of wool manufacturing, although distinct in respect to certain technical processes and grades of material used, still are competing branches of trade, because worsted and carded woolen goods are used for the same purposes. Consequently these tariff discriminations against the carded woolen industry aid the worsted branch of the business by injuring the latter's competitor.

MORE FAVORS FOR THE WORSTED SPINNERS.

Another and very serious defect in the Dingley and Payne bills is the practically prohibitory duties on the by-products of wool manufacturing. Here, again, we find a discrimination against one class of people and special privilege for another, because these by-products can be used only by carded woolen manufacturers, while worsted spinners, although they can not use them, have them for sale. This is one of the most serious of the tariff abuses from which we ask relief, as the duties on such by-products vary from 50 to 200 per cent.

The present wool schedule is practically that of 1867, which was primarily a war-revenue tax; and as all other schedules have been adjusted to meet changed conditions, this schedule should be redrawn to meet the changed conditions of woolgrowing and the wants of the manufacturers. Take Ohio wool, for example. The quality of wool grown in Ohio has changed in quality as well as in quantity. Fine merino was at one time the staple growth, but in a few years more that quality of wool will not be grown in Ohio. Much of the wool now grown there is from the mutton variety of sheep, and this wool carries a net protection of about 20 cents per scoured pound against 33 to 44 cents to the grower in the West.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNDER THE LAW.

We ask for an equal opportunity with all others under the law, in order that we may enjoy the reward of our labor, skill, and enterprise in the business in which we are engaged. It is in this capacity of carded woolen manufacturers that we make our appeal to you. But our demands should be granted not only in justice to us as carded woolen manufacturers, but in justice to the consumer of wool goods. We expressly disclaim any intention of representing here to-day the special interests of the consumer. We, however, call your attention to the fact that every burden on the carded woolen industry that we have mentioned is also a burden on the consumer of wool goods, whether underclothing, outside clothing, blankets, or other articles made of wool; and that the special privileges granted to the worsted branch of this industry result in an increase of these burdens not only on the carded woolen manufacturers, but also on the consumers in this country.

AD VALOREM TARIFF THE ONLY COMPLETE REMEDY.

It would not be possible at this time to go into detailed discussion of the proper remedies for the abuses to which we have called your attention.

We will state, however, that it is our firm belief that the only complete remedy for these inequalities is a tariff based on value. Specific duties based on the scoured weight of the wool and graduated on by-products by classifications according to value, or compound duties consisting of both specific and ad valorem rates, would give partial relief. But if the exigencies of the situation ever lead the Government to adopt any of these partial remedies, it should not be forgotten that they are partial, and that the only complete remedy is in an ad valorem tariff. The protective rate on wool goods is ad valorem, and if this can be made effective on manufactured goods, there can be no doubt of its efficiency on the raw material.

INVESTIGATE AND UPROOT ABUSES.

We ask that the tariff on wool and wool goods be thoroughly investigated and revised. We desire to have the principle of protection maintained for all producers, whether of wool, wool goods, or clothing. And we are as ready to have inequalities corrected in the tariff on wool goods as in the tariff on raw materials. We are ready to go into the consideration of the technical details of this problem with you or anyone you may designate, and to any extent you may desire. We are ready to do this with representatives of the woolgrowers, worsted manufacturers, and of the Government. We suggested such a conference to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. We have at all times been willing to carry out that suggestion, confident that the better the truth is known the better will be our chances to gain an equal opportunity under the law.

EVENHANDED JUSTICE, NO MORE AND NO LESS.

We represent an industry that covers nearly every State in the Union, has over three times as many establishments as has worsted manufacturing, and a greater number of employees. Under the present schedule many woolen mills have been closed, and a continuance of that schedule means great distress to many mill owners and operatives. We believed that the platform of the Republican party meant an honest revision of the tariff. On a recent visit to the Finance Committee we placed the injustice of the wool duties before it and were told that while we had a grievance the schedule could not be opened. We feel indignant that such treatment should be meted out to us; that the cardinal principles of fair play and evenhanded justice, under which we are supposed to live, should be cast aside or subordinated to a coalition of forces that are specially favored under the Dingley bill. Therefore, Mr. President, we appeal to you to use your influence in the proper quarter, so that this industry may have what it is entitled to under our Constitution—evenhanded justice, neither more nor less.

Respectfully, yours,

EDWARD MOIR,

President Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association.

His Excellency The President,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, from many letters received from woolen manufacturers, I offer one which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

COOPER UNDERWEAR COMPANY,
Kenosha, Wis., April 23, 1909.

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have your letter of April 22. We thought we had made plain in our letter of the 19th where there is a discrimination against the 1,500 wool manufacturers in favor of the few manufacturers of worsteds. The discrimination consists in this: That the duty on clothing wool and on combing wools is the same, and also because the duty is based upon the wool in the grease instead of in the scoured state.

As explained to you in ours of the 19th, clothing wools used by the woolen mills are high-shrinkage wools. Wools in that state carry a large amount of grease and foreign matter, which is scoured out in cleaning, but upon which dirt a duty is paid pound for pound with the wool.

The illustration we gave in ours of the 19th is that worsted and combing wools shrink even as low as 15 per cent. This 15 per cent of dirt, of course, pays the 11 cents per pound duty. Upon clothing wools, however, which are used by the woolen mills, the shrinkage is even as high as 80 per cent, and on this 80 per cent of dirt 11 cents duty is assessed and paid, which makes the wool pay five times the duty that it would pay if it was assessed on the scoured pound.

The point we make is this: That the duty should be based on the scoured pound, so that combing wools and clothing wools would bear the same duty. If not based on the scoured pound then the combing wools should bear at least three times as much duty. And in many instances it should pay five times as much to bring the two wools to a parity.

It is a fact that the best of the woolen mills are almost paralyzed by the competition they meet from the worsted mills which is due to the discrimination, although unintentional, of the two classes of wool used by the two industries which are using the same rate of duty in the unscoured state, but which duty should be assessed on the wool clean, which would put them on an even basis.

To prove what we say regarding the fact that woolen mills are paying more duty than the worsted mills you will please look about you and nearly every man you meet is wearing a suit of worsted, whereas a few years ago they were all wearing serges, chevots, and other classes of woolen fabrics made by the woolen mills.

We trust we have made ourselves clear to you, if not, we will be glad to write you again. We certainly assure you that this matter is a vital question with the woolen mills, and as stated before there are 10 to 1 worsted mill. The woolen mills are smaller in size, are scattered over the country, and can not concentrate their efforts in asking for justice in the matter of tariff as simply and as easily as can the large worsted mills, which readily get together and work solidly for their ends.

Trusting that this matter may receive your consideration, and that your efforts be effective, and thanking you in advance, we remain,
Very truly, yours,

COOPER UNDERWEAR CO.,
Per HENRY S. COOPER,
President and Treasurer.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have just this to say in recapitulation with respect to these amendments. In the first place, they change the classification of raw wool from three classes to two, and from specific to ad valorem duties. On the first and second class wool, which is made class 1 by my amendment, a duty of 45 per cent is imposed. This is practically the duty in the Dingley law. Upon the coarse wools embraced in class 3 of the Dingley law, provided for as class 2 in my amendment, I provide for an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent, which is practically the duty of to-day. It is not an increase of the existing duty upon the imports of the year upon which the table of estimates is based of more than the smallest fraction of a per cent, due to the fact that I state the ad valorem in round numbers for the two classes at 45 and 35 per cent ad valorem.

In reference to the amendments which follow, they simply carry over into the manufactured product the application of this ad valorem duty based, however, with respect to the protective duty and the compensatory duty, upon the investigations conducted by the government expert, which I submitted last evening.

There are many reasons for substituting an ad valorem duty on raw wool for the present specific duty. Without hurting the producer of raw wool the substitution will benefit the consumer and help the carded-wool industry in the desperate struggle for existence to which it is driven by the worsted industry.

While the average duty on raw wool is about 45 per cent, it is much higher on the coarse heavy-shrinking wools used by the poor and considerably below that on the finer light-shrinking wools used by the rich. If a 45 per cent duty on all imported wools were imposed, it would accord the same measure of protection to the farmer as it does to-day, and do away with the inequality just referred to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I gather from these letters which the Senator has had read and that I heard here this afternoon that there seems to be a conflict between what are called the "carded-wool people" and the worsted industry. Do any of these amendments, while helping the carded-wool people, while remedying what they think is an injustice, at the same time injure the worsted people in any way?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They take no duty away from any industry to which it would be fairly entitled in accordance with any just standard of protection. It accords to the manufacturer of worsted cloths, as well as to the manufacturer of woolen cloths, the measure of duty to which he is fairly entitled, as shown by the analyses which have been very carefully worked out by government experts.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I could not understand the objection of the worsted people to it, except upon one or two possible grounds. One, that these amendments, or any amendments which have been offered, might in some way injure them, or the other one which has been suggested here, that the worsted people really wanted to see the carded people go out of business. But the direct question is whether or not any of these amendments would do what might reasonably be called any possible injury to the worsted industry.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; these amendments would place the worsted industry and the woolen industry on an equal footing.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Would they put it at any disadvantage?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. At no disadvantage whatever. Under the amendments which I offer the worsted industry would be given duties to cover the difference in cost of production against foreign competition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Or would it give the carded people any advantage over them?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it would not. It would place them upon an equality with the worsted industry, whereas they are, under the provisions of the Dingley law, at a very great disadvantage.

The amendments which I propose would enable the carded-wool manufacturer to import cheap wool, where to-day the prohibitive duty compels him to make use of cotton and shoddy. This would, by no means, displace any of the domestic wools, since we can only supply to-day 60 per cent of our demand. It would merely enable the poor people to wear all-wool clothes,

where to-day they have to content themselves with shoddy and cotton.

The position of the carded-wool industry is such as to invite the earnest attention of Congress. It is the last branch of the wool industry which is still accessible to the man with moderate capital, since it does not require as complicated machinery or as expensive a plant as is necessary in the worsted industry. With the American Woolen Company in control of about 60 per cent of the output of American woolen cloth, and with the independent manufacturers of worsted cloth organizing into another combination, the carded-wool industry accords the only chance for the small manufacturer. Instead of being encouraged in its struggle for an independent existence, Congress lends its powerful aid to the trust in helping crush the carded-wool manufacturer out of existence.

I have already shown how the wool manufacturer is discriminated against through the specific duty on raw wool. The same discrimination pursues him in the distinction made between wools of the first and second class, those of the first class being subject to 11 cents per pound if unwashed, twice that amount if washed, and three times that amount if scoured, while the duty on wools of the second class, which are used by the worsted manufacturers only, is 12 cents a pound, whether washed or unwashed.

To sum up the disadvantage to the carded-wool industry: First, there is the natural disadvantage of being obliged to use the heavy shrinking wools which, under the specific duty, are subject to a much higher rate than the light wools used by the worsted industry. Second, the necessity of importing a heavy wool in the grease under what amounts to a penalty under the tariff of paying double duties if the wool is imported washed, while the powerful trust, which is already favored by technical conditions in the use of lighter wools, is granted an additional favor by Congress, which generously allows it to pay the same duty on washed wool as it does on unwashed. But Congress is not content to leave the small manufacturer with this handicap, as against this powerful trust, and adds another one by imposing an unreasonably high duty which can not be defended on any grounds of logic or fact on two products of the worsted industry, which constitute the raw material of yarn, viz, tops and noils. Tops are the long wools separated in the process of combing in the worsted mills, which are used in spinning worsted yarn. Although they are less advanced in the process of manufacture than yarn, they are subject to the same duty as woolen cloth, which is the final product of several stages of manufacture, in each of which labor is an important factor.

Mr. President, I do not know, I say, whether it will be possible to fix the attention of the Senate long enough upon these different manifestations of injustice to effect any change in this legislation.

But, Mr. President, I am going to do as best I can my part and share to make a record of it, and to get it before the country, because I am looking forward to a time when we shall secure a real revision of the tariff—a revision in accordance with the public interest and public demand; a revision in keeping with the promises of the Republican party.

Such revision is not provided in this bill, but it will come.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. I followed the Senator last evening very carefully in his analysis of this question and listened very attentively to the reading of the amendments, and I am disposed to vote for the amendments. I believe they are calculated to reach an evil; that, while they leave the worsted manufacturer protected as to foreign competition, they take from the worsted manufacturer some advantages which to-day he has over the carded industry.

But I want to say to the Senator here are 24 amendments, I think, going to this whole subject. I do not believe that anyone, except those who may have listened very carefully last night and very carefully to the reading of the amendments, can efficiently apply those amendments to the present system, even with the careful statement which the Senator is making at this time, and with all the explanation which the Senator will be able to make this evening. If there was any way of bringing it about—I do not know whether we can—so as to have those amendments printed, that Senators could take them and compare them with the present law, I believe it would be at least more satisfactory to those of us who are trying to make an effort to place before the Senate the proposition for a change in this system.

I do not know whether that can be done or not. If it can not be, I feel very certain that the Senator's amendments are going

to suffer in the votes which will be had upon them by reason of Senators who might desire to vote for them not seeing their way clear sufficiently to understand them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be very glad indeed to have these amendments printed in the RECORD and voted upon to-morrow morning, if that will meet with the approval of the Senate.

Mr. CLAPP. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the amendments may lie over and be printed, and be acted upon in the morning.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Minnesota seriously think that he will have time between now and to-morrow morning to master the intricacies of the various amendments?

Mr. CLAPP. The intricacies of these amendments are not as formidable as they were a few days ago. I think a great many Senators are beginning to realize that this system which has stood here for years after all does not meet the situation. I believe a great many Senators are beginning to realize that notwithstanding the legislation sought to have been enacted for the sheep grower, somehow the sheep industry in this country has not prospered under the legislation as it ought to have prospered. I believe that the average Senators, with the discussions we have had upon this question and with the study that has been given to the question, will be able, if they could have the amendments printed so that they could take them and compare them line for line and page for page, so that they will know just what change would be effected by these proposed amendments—they would be prepared, at least, much better to-morrow morning than they will be prepared to-night to vote upon them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that there is not anything complicated or formidable at all about these amendments or about Schedule K.

Mr. CLAPP. It may sound egotistical, but I undertake to say that we have been led to believe that there is something mysterious, something incomprehensible in these things that the ordinary individual is not able even to get a sort of glimmering idea of, but in the analysis of this question in the last few days that has, to my mind at least, very largely disappeared.

Mr. ALDRICH. I must have misapprehended the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota. I understood the Senator from Minnesota to suggest that the amendments go over in order that they might be examined for the purpose of finding out what the effect of them would be. I understand that now everybody has arrived at a conclusion.

Mr. CLAPP. I submit that that is not a fair criticism upon what I said.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. What I said was that if the amendments could be printed, Senators could then take the amendments and read them and have them on their desks and compare them with the bill, whereas to-night in the one or two readings of the amendments before the Senate it would be difficult for Senators to understand just the force and scope of the amendments in their relations to the pending bill. That is what I said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will state to the Senator from Rhode Island that when the Senator from Minnesota made the request, which was not a very extraordinary request, but rather a reasonable one, the Senator from Rhode Island responded as a reason for refusing it, Does the Senator from Minnesota think that he can master the intricacies of Schedule K and these amendments by to-morrow morning? Then the Senator from Minnesota responded that it was not so mysterious, after all.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood from his last statement that he had already mastered the mysteries—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. How could he master the mysteries by hearing 24 amendments read?

Mr. ALDRICH. And that he was ready to vote, as far as he was concerned.

Mr. CLAPP. I did say that having paid particular attention last night to the analysis of this question, and having paid particular attention to the reading of the amendments, I was prepared, and for one I am prepared now, to vote for these amendments.

But I want to say this, Mr. President: We are legislating to-day for a great people, and one thing is absolutely certain, as was uttered by the Secretary of the Treasury last Saturday night at Chicago. Either this bill will meet the approval of the American people or the agitation upon revision will be immediately renewed by the American people.

It may be, sir, that when the proposition of the Senator from Wisconsin comes to be analyzed it is not worth considering; but when we stand confronted here by a system that has existed for years, a system that has been passed repeatedly and passed upon the theory that it was in the interest of the in-

dustry of America, and when in the face of that assertion and that legislation we have seen that industry fall far short of prospering as it should; when we realize the importance and the market in this land of ours for mutton, as no other market perhaps in the world, and that coupled with this industry while the tariff sought to protect and develop the industry, we have seen the industry fail to prosper as it should prosper, I believe that, standing here to-night for the American people, we can well afford to devote even one night's time to the proposition of printing and placing before the Members of this body the proposition of the Senator from the State of Wisconsin. It will not be time entirely lost, even though it should turn out that, upon an analysis of the proposed amendments, few, if any, Senators could support them.

This question is worth looking into, because we stand confronted to-night by the undeniable fact that for some reason the effort in the past to develop the sheep industry of this country has not succeeded as under all the conditions, with our climatic conditions and our great population furnishing a great market for the mutton itself, the industry should have developed. Somewhere in the system of the past there is a radical mistake. I do not say, sir, that the Senator from Wisconsin has found the remedy; but it does seem to me that, in view of the importance of this question, we can well afford to let the amendments be printed, so that Senators may have them on their desks to-morrow morning.

While I am on my feet there is one other thing I want to say. In an ordinary session of Congress, when one Senator is busy with the work of his committee and another Senator is busy with the work of his committee, and the work of a particular committee does not come to the other Senators in their respective every-day experience, it is very natural that when a bill comes in here recommended by a committee, as those who are not on that committee would not have an opportunity to study the question, being engaged with the work of their own committees, having little opportunity, if any at all, we accept the report of the committee.

But, Mr. President, I have heard it time and time again that we must stand by the committee here. I undertake to say that in this discussion and in this revision of the tariff there is nothing sacred in the report of this committee. The report of this committee is entitled to respect only so far as the experience of its members and the time and study which they have given to the subject entitles it to receive.

In an extra session, when there is no other committee work, every Member of the Senate has the same amount of time, the same opportunity by access to the sources of information, the hearings before the House committee, that the members of this committee have. Consequently, instead of accepting the dictum of a committee, as we so often do when we can not take up the work outside of our own committees, in this case, when we are here with nothing else to do but to study this question, I submit that one man's investigation, if he possesses the same ability of investigation, is as good as another man's. I for one do not subscribe to the doctrine that in an extra session of Congress, when every Member has the same time to spend and has access to the same sources of information, that we have to take the dictum of a committee, especially in a case where it stands self-confessed that in all the years that have gone, when with but few exceptions the legislation was designed to build up and develop a particular industry, we find that industry languishing under the legislation of past years.

Again I ask the Senate for unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin may lie upon the table and be printed, and that the matter be taken up on the assembling of the Senate to-morrow morning.

Mr. ALDRICH obtained the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ALDRICH. For what purpose does the Senator desire to interrupt me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to suggest to the Senator, if he will permit me, that the consideration of these amendments and the vote will certainly exhaust this evening. I understand the request of the Senator from Minnesota to be simply that we postpone the vote until to-morrow morning at 10.30 o'clock. The vote will take only seven minutes and a half; so it only trespasses upon to-morrow that short space of time in yielding to the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the propositions of the Senator from Wisconsin are, to my mind, perfectly simple. The Senator proposes to levy an ad valorem duty upon all classes of wool of 45 per cent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not upon all classes of wool; upon wools of the first and second class. Let me correct the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Wools of the first and second class. That is a perfectly simple proposition. The Senator from Wisconsin estimates that that will increase duties upon first and second class wools slightly. That is his estimate. It is a perfectly simple proposition whether that slight increase shall be made and whether Senators would like to put an ad valorem rate in place of specifics.

It seems to me there is nothing unreasonable in asking that a vote be taken upon this proposition. We have had, I do not know how many, but I should say a score of votes, to-day in the Senate, yeas and nays, involving all these propositions.

The Senator from Minnesota says that Senators are not obliged to follow the committee. No member of the committee has ever made such a suggestion, and I have never seen any indication of a desire on the part of certain Senators to follow the committee so far, and there certainly has been no fault found that they have not. They have been exercising their independent judgment and they have been voting against the committee, as they have a perfect right to do. There has been no restraint put upon anybody that I know of to vote with the committee on any vote in connection with the bill.

Now, we have passed upon these questions to-day by a great variety of votes, involving, I think, every phase of this subject. I am quite sure that neither the Senator from Wisconsin nor the Senator from Minnesota nor the Senator from Indiana expects the Senate to reverse its deliberate action to-day and vote for an ad valorem duty on wool. I do not believe there is a man in this Chamber who has the slightest idea that the Senate will change its action in this respect and try to impose an ad valorem duty on wool.

I do not want to be unreasonable about this business. If we can get an agreement to take the vote upon the assembling of the Senate to-morrow without any further discussion, I certainly will agree to it. I do not want to be unreasonable about it. I am willing to go on with the free list and spend the time between now and 11 o'clock in accomplishing something upon the bill, with the understanding that the vote shall be taken upon the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin upon the assembling of the Senate to-morrow morning at a quarter to 11.

Mr. KEAN. Without further debate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Without further debate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Wisconsin has not yielded the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is an attempt, I understand, to reach some agreement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator as to agreeing to vote immediately upon the assembling of the Senate to-morrow morning, or in ten or fifteen minutes. The Senator will at once see that that would not be reasonable or just to a Senator who wanted to study these amendments and who would have a question or two questions to ask before voting upon them. He could not ask them.

Mr. ALDRICH. What time would the Senator suggest?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know; I am suggesting merely any time that is reasonable; but the suggestion to vote immediately upon assembling is hardly reasonable.

Mr. ALDRICH. The discussion can go on to-night. I suggest that at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning we take a vote on the propositions of the Senator from Wisconsin without further discussion. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] also has certain amendments which he desires to have voted on, and I should like to include those if we could.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator from Georgia has intimated that he wishes to take fifteen or twenty minutes in presenting his amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not mean to cut off the Senator from Georgia. It would be perfectly agreeable for me to vote at half past 11 to-morrow morning upon these propositions.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understand that there is a proposition—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thought the Senator from Wisconsin had yielded the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I had not yielded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa, as I have yielded to other Senators.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand there is a proposition to vote at a quarter to 11 in the morning.

Mr. ALDRICH. At half-past 11, I am willing to make it, if that is satisfactory to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. It depends entirely upon how much time the Senator from Wisconsin will occupy in submitting his amendments. I have some observations to make upon this schedule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will get through in a very few minutes. I will conclude to-night.

Mr. CUMMINS. The observations I desire to make, however, I would prefer to submit after I have had an opportunity to read the amendments, and therefore I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will consent to the suggestion made by the Senator from Minnesota. I shall not detain the Senate very long upon the subject.

Mr. ALDRICH. Suppose we say 12 o'clock. I think that would certainly give sufficient time. I should like to dispose of this schedule. I certainly have not cut anybody off from a reasonable discussion. I am yielding to the suggestions of Senators. I expected to get a vote on these amendments to-night. The Senator from Wisconsin expected to get a vote on the amendments to-night. Both of us expected that. But I want to be perfectly reasonable about it, and if we can fix some time, say 12 o'clock to-morrow, that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am entirely willing to agree to vote at 12 o'clock if I can have fifteen or twenty minutes between half past 10 and 12.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not necessary to spend all this time in higgling over this matter. I believe that the time for adjournment expires at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It does. That is the regular order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was perfectly willing that the amendments should be disposed of this evening if they could be disposed of all at one time, because I did not wish to consume the time of the Senate. I know what will happen to the amendments when they are voted upon perfectly well, no matter how well they are explained and how perfectly satisfactory they are to everybody who wants to reform the abuses of Schedule K. I understand that; and with a view of getting along with this matter, I submitted to the Senator from Rhode Island that the vote might be taken upon all of the amendments together, because when Senators have worked them out as I have they will find that they are consistent and are based upon a principle which starts with an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent or less on wools which are now known as "wools of the first and second class," and 35 per cent on wools of the third class. It then applies the compensatory duty and the protective duty according to the results of the investigations which have been made showing what the labor cost and the wage cost is which should be protected by the duty.

Now, Mr. President, if it is going to be any hardship for members to vote upon this matter to-night we can get along, I think, by debating it to 11 o'clock and then voting on it when we get to it to-morrow. We do not have to bargain and deal about this business.

Mr. CLAY rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield in a moment. As far as I was concerned, I was perfectly willing if I could make it appear so that Senators could understand it, and there was not any disposition to debate it further, to have a vote upon it, and to dispose of it.

I confess that I have held the floor in debating the schedule on cotton and the schedule on wools, it may be somewhat at length; but I do not believe that there is anybody who will say that I have done anything that was not the entire right of a Senator to do here who in good faith is discussing the measure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I must yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLAY. Go ahead.

Mr. ALDRICH. My desire was to accommodate all the Senators. As that does not seem to be possible, to the satisfaction of all Senators, I withdraw the suggestion, and we will go on with the bill.

Mr. CLAY. I simply desire to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. It is a difficult matter to understand 24 amendments. I do not desire to vote on 24 amendments unless I know what they are. I should like to ask the Senator, taking the entire amendments, how do they compare with the Dingley rates and how do they compare with the rates fixed by the Senate committee's bill? I understood the Senator from Rhode

Island to state that the rates proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin are higher than those in the pending bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Applying the ad valorem on the raw wools it figures out a fraction less than 45 per cent on the average rate of duties in class 1 and class 2, and in order not to write into the proposed amendments 44 and a fraction per cent, I put it at round numbers, 45 per cent. It may be said to be the slightest fraction of a percentage of increase over existing duties as measured upon the imports of this year.

But it is fair to say that the proposed amendment on raw wool is an ad valorem of the same duty as the specific duty in the existing law. Then, I have carried into the manufactured goods the same ad valorem to take the place of the specific compensatory duty, but I base it upon the measure of compensation, which it is shown by the investigations they are entitled to receive in order to fully compensate for the wool that actually enters into the cloth. Then for the protective duty I have carried in the same calculation based upon the investigations by the government experts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will go one step further and say what I know to be the fact, that all the amendments together make a very substantial reduction over the rates as fixed in the bill by the Senate committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They make a much more complete and thorough reduction than any amendments which have been offered to the Senate upon this schedule, taken altogether, and yet do not go one shade below what is a fair protective duty as ascertained by thoroughgoing investigations of all the industries covered in Schedule K.

Mr. BAILEY. Therefore it is the Senator's desire, as they together form a complete system, to have them voted upon at the same time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought that would be better. I do not stickle about that. I am perfectly willing to have the first amendment fixing an ad valorem duty instead of a specific duty on wool voted upon separately, if that is desired by Senators.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator that I myself would not hesitate to apply an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent as against a specific duty that amounts to an ad valorem equivalent of 44.52, and that is substantially what it is; yet there might be Senators who would not want to vote for even a fraction of 1 per cent increase on a particular amendment. Therefore, a Senator in that frame of mind voting upon all the amendments together would more than offset this particular increase by the other and greater decreases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to have the Senator make it plain in the RECORD that the whole reason for making this increase of a mere fraction of 1 per cent was simply to make an ad valorem duty—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In round numbers.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not recall that anybody who ever prepared a tariff bill has followed the ad valorem duties by fractional per cents.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think that can be found anywhere in the tariff history of the country. I took 45 per cent as the nearest per cent which could be stated in full numbers without the fraction, that was all. If I had taken 44 per cent, it would have been objected to as a reduction upon the duties on raw wool by Senators who otherwise might be willing to support the general plan of a reduction along the whole line involved in all these amendments.

Mr. President, I am going over this matter as carefully as I can in order to have it well and thoroughly understood. When interrupted by the question I had just brought again to the attention of the Senate the unjust advantage that has been given to the worsted industry. There has been worked into this tariff legislation a proposition that they shall have an unreasonably high duty upon two products of the worsted industry which constitute the raw material for the woolen industry, namely, tops and noils.

I suppose that the Senate understands what constitutes tops. Some correspondence has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which, upon its face, has the appearance of an influence exerted by these worsted mills to their great advantage at the time of the framing of the Dingley law.

Let us get in our minds here to-night just what tops are. Tops are the long wools which are separated in the process of combing in the worsted mills, such as the Whitman Mill, for instance. These long-combing fibers are used in spinning worsted yarns. They are not so much advanced as yarn in the process of manufacturing. They have not had so much labor

put upon them, and yet they are subject to the same duty as the woolen cloth. That does not look reasonable, does it? That appears to be a sort of carbuncle on this perfect system of protection on this sacred wool schedule which nobody has been permitted to lay hands on during all these years. Can anybody justify that discrimination? I have not heard any justification for it. Do Senators think that discrimination should be legislated again into this revision of the tariff by this Congress? Are Senators willing to go out and defend a new tariff bill that shall have this same provision in it, which seems to have gotten its place in the old Dingley law through influences—as disclosed by the correspondence placed before this body—that have not been explained, and that, without explanation, on their face do not look just exactly right?

It does seem to me that anyone can defend economically the proposition that these tops combed out of wool, not made into yarn, shall have the same duty as woolen cloth. There ought to be some explanation of that. That correspondence is a piece of evidence that points pretty strongly to this worsted industry having had an undue influence in the making of Schedule K, and it gives pretty strong support to the claim of these half-starved woolen mills all over the country that somebody has made this tariff in favor of this rich and powerful organization that has been built up to dominate the wool industry, to crowd out woolens, and to make the people of the country purchase and wear worsteds instead.

Now, I say again, although tops are less advanced in the process of manufacture than yarns, they are subject to the same duty as woolen cloth, which is the final product of several stages of manufacture, in each of which labor is a most important factor. As a result of this, such concerns like Mr. Whitman's Arlington Mills, which makes both tops and yarn, are able to charge an unfairly high price for the tops to the small spinning mills and to deprive them of their raw material whenever the large spinners choose to do so. The small spinner is completely at the mercy of the large mills, because the prohibitive duty on tops completely cuts off the foreign supply.

The story of the surreptitious removal of all reference to tops in the Dingley bill, through manipulation behind closed doors in the Senate Finance Committee by paid representatives of the worsted industry, is on record in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee (p. 5490-5492), reluctantly admitted by the chief manipulator of that industry.

Sensational disclosures made at the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee compelled its chairman to make a specific provision for tops in paragraph 371 of the bill, by which they were to be subject to the same duty as scoured wool of which they are made, and 6 cents per pound in addition.

That was enough. Such was the opinion of Chairman PAYNE and of his committee after going into this matter with a great deal of care. I will not say that the same interest which wrought this change in the duty in 1897, which gave to tops its special and particular place, has been operating again; but, for some reason or other, the provision of the Ways and Means Committee is completely stricken out in the Senate bill and tops, not being specially mentioned, go back to the place they had in the Dingley law, and continue to enjoy the protection which is accorded to woolen cloth.

The average ad valorem duty on raw wool is less than 45 per cent. My amendment proposes a duty of 45 per cent on wool, which is a little higher than the average, and therefore can not be assailed on the ground of insufficient protection. It will have the advantage, however, of doing away with the inequalities in the present specific duties on raw wool, which results in excessive rates on the cheaper grades, and very low rates on the more expensive grades of wool.

On page 5709 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee Mr. Clark testified that wages make up to 20 to 25 per cent of the cost of the goods, as against 60 per cent for material. This agrees with the figures given above.

Mr. Whitman, speaking as the chairman of a committee appointed by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, to disprove Mr. Clark's figures, makes a statement on page 160 of the Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for March, 1909, in which he takes issue with Mr. Clark's statement that wool makes up 60 per cent of the cost of the goods, saying that—

The general understanding among manufacturers is that the wool makes up 50 per cent of the cost of the cloth.

He takes no issue, however, with the other part of Mr. Clark's statement as to the proportion of wages to the total cost of the cloth, apparently because the figures can not be assailed.

Mr. Whitman, as I have just stated, assumes that the material constitutes 50 per cent of the value of the cloth. Mr. Moir, representing the carded-wool industry, estimates the wool as 65

per cent of the value of the cloth. In a statement to the Ways and Means Committee, which appears on page 5660, Mr. Clark's estimate quoted above is 60 per cent.

To give the woolen industry the benefit of the doubt, as a protectionist, I shall take the highest figure again, namely, 65 per cent. In that case the compensating duty on woolen cloth on the basis of an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent on raw wool should be 45 per cent of 65, or 30 per cent. Although I have shown the labor cost to be 25 per cent, I shall allow, in order to be on the safe side, 30 per cent, and will assume that wages are 100 per cent higher than in England, while Mr. Clark found them from 17 per cent to 125 per cent. Therefore, I am allowing the most ample margins in applying the ad valorem duties to this woolen schedule.

On the basis of these very liberal assumptions the protective duty on woolen cloth should be 30 per cent, making a total duty of 30 per cent and 30 per cent, or 60 per cent ad valorem. Since allowing 30 per cent for labor and 65 per cent for material, it leaves 5 per cent of the total cost unaccounted for.

I shall add this 5 per cent also to the duty, making the total duty 65 per cent ad valorem, which I offer as an amendment for the present complicated compound duties on various manufactures of wool. To enlarge a little on how the rate is obtained, the compensatory duty of 45 per cent on the wool should be carried through the entire schedule. A piece of cloth valued at \$1 has in it 65 cents worth of wool. That is allowing all that Mr. Whitman claims to be material; it is allowing more than Mr. Clark finds to be material, and allowing all that Mr. Moir claims to be material.

A piece of cloth valued, as I say, at \$1, has in it 65 cents worth of wool; the compensatory duty of 45 per cent upon that 65 cents of material is 30 cents when you reduce it to a specific equivalent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEYBURN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.
Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the other 60 per cent?
Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is labor.
Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, I see.
Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All that, overhead charges and everything.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I see. I misunderstood. The whole material is how much?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Whitman says that 65 per cent should be charged up against material.

The compensatory duty of 45 per cent upon this 65 cents is 30 cents, which is the amount of the compensatory duty which should be paid. Thirty cents is 30 per cent of the value of the cloth; therefore an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent is equal to the duty of 45 per cent upon the raw wool.

Next, the labor cost of the material is 30 cents, or 30 per cent of the total value. Assuming that wages are 100 per cent higher in this country than abroad, the protective duty, therefore, on the one dollar's worth of cloth should be 30 cents, or 30 per cent of the total value.

Therefore we have 30 per cent for the material and 30 per cent for the labor to be provided for in an ad valorem duty.

The material being 65 per cent of the value and the labor 30 per cent of the value, we have 5 per cent of the value unaccounted for, but which is really made up of the expense of manufacture other than labor. I assume that even in this the cost in this country is 100 per cent greater than abroad. Therefore, in arriving at 65 per cent as the proper ad valorem duty, it is made up as follows:

	Per cent.
Material	30
Labor	30
Other expense	5

Making a total of 65 per cent, which more than covers all proper compensatory and protective duties required.

The proposed rate would do away with the crying inequality of the compound duties which result in much higher rates on cheaper cloth than the rates on the expensive varieties, as I have had occasion to demonstrate in the course of my remarks.

Mr. President, I am advised that it is desired on the part of the Finance Committee to take an adjournment at this time; and therefore I yield the floor. I ask, Mr. President, that my amendments may be printed in the Record and that they also be printed and placed upon the desks of Senators to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

[The amendments referred to appear earlier in the course of Mr. LA FOLLETTE's remarks.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator who has just yielded the floor [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] introduced some matter earlier in the evening that referred to the woolgrowers, and so forth. I have here a telegram just received from the National Woolgrowers' Association, and as it contains but a few lines, I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Gen. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Woolgrowers' Association, representing over 500,000 sheep farmers of the United States, requests that you transmit to each Member of the United States Senate the earnest request that he support Schedule K duties on wool and woolsens, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee. Any revision of these duties downward will destroy an industry employing more than 3,000,000 hands in growing and manufacturing wool.

THE NATIONAL WOOLGROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Geo. S. WALKER, Secretary.

DEATH OF REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is with deep regret, which I know is shared by all Senators, that I rise to make formal announcement of the death of the Chaplain of the Senate, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale. I am sure that all Senators who have known him here during the past six years will feel in his death the loss of a personal friend and of one whose kindness has made him beloved, I think, by everybody with whom he has been brought in contact.

He was a man of great patriotism; and so long as men love works of the imagination and love their country his famous story will be read. A brilliant writer, a great preacher; he was greatest of all, I think, in the unwearied service to which his long life was given in behalf of humanity. If any man ever had the right to say to the Recording Angel the words of Abou Ben Adhem, "Write me as one who loves his fellow-men," it was he.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, supplementing the appropriate and touching words of the honored Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and voicing the feelings of my own heart, I beg to submit the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 57) as follows:

Senate resolution 57.

Resolved, That we have heard with profound regret and sorrow of the death of Rev. Edward E. Hale, D. D., late Chaplain of the Senate of the United States. Doctor Hale's services to literature, philanthropy, and religion are known the world over and place him in the front rank of the Nation's benefactors. The Senate desires in this way to place on record its appreciation of the distinguished character and eminent services of this great and good man.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 11, 1909, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 10, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, offered the following prayer:

Infinite and Eternal Spirit, Father of all souls, above all, through all, and in us all, humbly and reverently do we bow in Thy presence, acknowledging with love and gratitude all that has come down to us out of the past to the uplift, ennobling, and purifying of mankind; and we most fervently pray that if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, we may cherish these things in our hearts and strive earnestly as individuals and as a Nation to live whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.

Our hearts are touched profoundly by the news of the death of the Rev. Edward Everett Hale, Chaplain of the United States Senate, who for so long has been a conspicuous figure in the affairs of our Nation, contributing in his sermons, in his writings, in his prayers, in his life to the uplift of mankind. God grant to be with the aged wife and the children, that

they may be comforted in the thought of all he has contributed and left to us, and Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of H. R. Huffman, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SLEMP, by unanimous consent, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GRIEST, indefinitely, because of illness.

To Mr. FOSS, on account of illness in his family.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from New York to withhold his motion for a moment. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 74.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information, namely:

The amounts of all appropriations for river and harbor improvements, with the date of each appropriation and the specific purpose for which it was made, which appropriations are affected by section 10 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1909.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from New York will permit me, I will state the object of this resolution. The sundry civil act approved March 4, 1909, required that all unexpended balances of appropriations of a certain character on the books of the Treasurer on July 1, 1904, which were not expended or which had not been obligated by contract, should be covered into the general fund. It is now asserted that this may seriously affect a number of appropriations which have been made for river and harbor improvements.

The War Department claims that there are some appropriations more than five years old for river and harbor improvements which have not yet been obligated by contract. A request has been made that section 10 of the sundry civil act passed in the last session be amended so as to eliminate from its operations certain appropriations for river and harbor improvement. It seems to me that the Members of the House should know if there are appropriations more than five years old for river and harbor improvements for which no contracts have yet been made, and the information is necessary also in order to determine whether this act should be amended to exempt appropriations of this character. Every Member of the House who is interested in river and harbor improvements should be glad to know whether appropriations made for such purpose prior to July 1, 1904, have been lying idle in the Treasury more than five years without even a contract having been made for their expenditure.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution a very proper one. The information has already been compiled by the Chief of Engineers, who has furnished it to some of us, including the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the purpose outlined by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York, before he takes his seat, whether this information is in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury or in the hands of the Board of Engineers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was in some doubt as to whether the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of War should be asked for this information, but the provisions of the act require the Secretary of the Treasury to cover the money into the Treasury, and I have no doubt that if he be asked for the information he will obtain it, even if he has to consult the Department of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1909.